

The date on which your subscription expires will be found in the wrapper.
The paper will be stopped on that day unless previously renewed.

WEEKLY PEOPLE.

Agents sending in subscriptions without remittance must state distinctly how they are to be paid.
Agents are personally charged with and held responsible for unpaid subscriptions sent in by them.

VOL. X. NO. 37

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1900.

PRICE 2 CENTS.

DEBATE ON TRADE UNIONISM

Held at the Grand Opera House,
New Haven, Connecticut,

November 25, 1900,

BETWEEN

DANIEL DE LEON,

REPRESENTING THE SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOR
ALLIANCE,

— AND —

JOB HARRIMAN,

REPRESENTING OLD STYLE OR PURE AND SIMPLE
TRADE UNIONISM.

Copyright, 1900, by the New York Labor News Company.

On taking the chair, Mr. Wm. E. Clegg, of Yale University, announced the subject and distribution of time as follows:

The question is, **RESOLVED, THAT THE TACTICS OF THE SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOR ALLIANCE AGAINST THE PURE AND SIMPLE TRADES UNION IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE WORKING CLASS AND FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.** The time of the debate will be divided as follows: for the presentation of their arguments the gentlemen will have thirty minutes each; for rebuttal, Mr. Daniel De Leon of the Socialist Labor Party, will have twenty minutes; Mr. Harriman of the Social Democratic Party, thirty minutes; Mr. De Leon closing the speech in a ten minute period. At the five minutes before the expiration of the thirty and twenty minute periods one stroke of the gavel will signify that the gentlemen have five minutes to complete their periods. At the end of nine minutes, during the ten minute period one stroke of the gavel will be given. The first speaker of the evening will be Mr. Daniel De Leon.

DE LEON:
Working men and working women of New Haven: The question that is to be presented to you here to-night is, in my opinion, a pivotal question—the trades union question—a question that is blocking the way to progress, and the correct solution of which is essential to the interests of the working class and of the Socialist movement of the land. It is a question that has to be approached deliberately and calmly. I come not to win a victory. There is no such question here in my mind as to whether I or any one else wins a snap victory at this meeting. I propose to speak to you deliberately. It is a question of facts and close reasoning. It is a question, the facts concerning which you will have to take home with you and consider there. It is not a question as to what man wins, but a question whether our common country shall win, and whether this trade union question can be at all solved.

The trades union policy of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance involves the trade union policy of the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party. That policy was not evolved out of the inner consciousness of any one man or set of men. It is a policy that is based upon certain facts, certain historic facts, certain undeniable facts, and established upon conclusions that are not escapable from. In choosing these facts, I have been careful to take only such as are over and above dispute. Only children wrangle over facts; men agree upon them. Now, I do not suppose that this meeting has come here to witness a "washing of dirty linen" with mutual criminations and recriminations. The facts I shall present to you are facts known to be facts, or, if they are not known to be such by my audience, my audience can easily verify them, because they are all taken from the official organs of the very organizations against whom we stand arrayed.

The first principle upon which the Socialists stand is this: that the permanent improvement of the working class, let alone their emancipation, is impossible, unless they obtain absolute control of the government and thereby turn this capitalist system into the Socialist Republic. That is a fundamental principle with us.

The second principle is this: the conquest of the public powers by the S. L. P. is an impossibility over-night. It will take at least four years from the time that the workingmen commence to march actually and intelligently towards their emancipation. It may take ten, it may take twenty years. In the meantime what shall be done? Something is wanted NOW. Some economic relief is demanded now. The political organization can only come into play once a year. In this State only once every two years. At any rate, it can come into play only occasionally. The workingmen need something else besides. They need an organization that may give some relief, however temporary. An intelligent physician will attend a serious sickness, overlooking entirely the palliatives that he might give his patient. However much an economic organization may give palliatives only, however entirely those things may be palliatives, they are something; it is a relief and the workingmen need it, and need it badly. Now then, the only organization that can give that temporary relief is the economic organization, the trades union.

Accordingly, the S. L. P. builds upon this second principle: that the trades union which can do good to the working men must be a trades union which has a certain central character; it must recognize the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class. The trade union that doesn't recognize that much, so that it may be kept from entanglements that the conflicting interests of their competing employers might bring them into, a trades union that doesn't recognize the class struggle will find itself arrayed against other workingmen of different trades, sometimes of their own trade, according to the temporary interests of their employer. A workingmen's organization that is not a trades union, a workingmen's organization that imagines that the interests of the capitalist class and the interests of the working class are one and the same—such an organization and such workingmen are simply appendages to the capitalist class, and will be drawn into the vortex of competing capitalist conflicts. (Applause.) Don't take

away my time. That is the second principle. We must have an economic organization and we must have a political organization. We see in Germany a magnificent political movement, substantially a workingmen's movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen declines steadily. Why? Because there is no economic organization worth mentioning. In the United States we see a big, substantially big, trades union movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen goes down steadily. Why? Because here the political movement is insignificant. In France, where the political movement is strong and the trades union, intelligent trades union, is strong, there we can with justice say that large areas of the workingmen have been improved, while the struggle is going on. We need an economic organization accordingly, that moves under the protecting glass of a labor political party.

Now then, arrived so far, the question is, Are there such trade unions in existence? If you want a thing and you find something in the way that calls itself what you are looking for, you are not going to build one; you will try to get along with it, if possible. Working in this direction, the Socialists, organized in the Socialist Labor Party, came across a movement that was said to be a trades union movement. It came across organizations of working men. Now the present policy of the Socialists in the Socialist Labor Party is dictated by these two principles that I have just mentioned, plus the experience made with the existing unions that we found, and right here a short sketch of those unions will be necessary.

We found organizations of workingmen, but we found that they were marked with exactly the reverse of the central character that was necessary for a workingmen's organization. Instead of being class-conscious, they built upon the principle of the brotherhood of the workingman and the capitalist. As a result of that, they moved for higher wages, and right after that they gave up whatever they had gained. They were torn apart themselves by the interests of the capitalist class. At that time these trade unions, guided by a natural instinct, and yet by an untutored instinct, moved in a peculiar way. The giant was blind. He struck in the air, and sometimes his blows fell upon individual capitalists. The capitalist class then proceeded to endeavor to control the trade union, and a struggle took place within the unions. On the one side were the Socialists; the other the capitalists. Socialists and representatives of the capitalists found themselves within the trade unions, struggling each of them to get control of that organization—the Socialists trying to get control of that organization for the working men; the representatives of the capitalists trying to get control of that organization for the capitalist class. The result of it was that the Socialists were beaten.

In that struggle, the Socialist movement being weak, the Socialists went under, and presently the trades union movement became in the country an engine of the capitalist, controlled by the capitalist through what Mark Hanna has just called the "labor lieutenants" of the capitalist class. These men, who are the officers of the unions, and whom we have termed labor fakirs, or the Organized Scabbery of the union—these labor fakirs, this Organized Scabbery, these labor lieutenants of the capitalists in the unions have controlled the union absolutely in the economic interests of the capitalist class, and obedient to the dictates of the capitalists.

We have seen for instance in New York, it is an open secret, that the recent trolley strike was a stock exchange strike, dictated by the magnates who wanted to force down the price of stock so as to buy in cheaply, and that strike was ordered by these men, and carried out by their labor lieutenants. We saw the strike of the miners in Pennsylvania ordered by the United Mine Workers against De Armit, and the rank and file were forced into that battle and sacrificed as food for cannon, not obedient to the interests of the working men, but obedient to the interests of the capitalists, who gave the orders to their labor lieutenants, the labor fakirs in the unions.

We saw more. We saw that every time the revolutionary pulse was felt within the unions, and the rank and file wanted something, the capitalist influence was felt potent within the union. Through his labor lieutenants, the capitalist managed to still that pulse, and operating his labor lieutenants like lightning rods, he ran the revolutionary lightning into the ground. We have seen, for instance, when the miners of Alabama, wanting to wring better conditions from their employers, elected upon a revolutionary program their delegates to the convention, that the mine operators ordered their labor lieutenants, the Miners' Union's officers, to somehow or other annul those elections and start new elections; that this new order was carried out, and that another convention was thus chosen agreeable to the employers, instead of what it was at first. We have seen for instance that when miners at Hazleton felt indignant at being shot by the sheriffs of capitalism, it was again a lieutenant of labor, Mr. Fahy, whom the capitalists gave free tickets to reach the place, churches and halls to speak in, and who there addressed the men, saying that these employers were good men, that it was a mistake, that it was not meant, and that they should stop hating their employers, they should go back to work and forget the butcheries.

I will not mention more illustrations. These will do. Such a trade union movement, whatever it was, was no longer a movement of the working class, any more than an army that consists of working men is a workingmen's army if it is manned and officered by the representatives of the capitalist class.

With that experience the Socialists said, something has to be done with these organizations, which are carrying the working men down to destruction, these organizations which are controlled by the lieutenants of the capitalist class, where every pulse of the revolutionary feeling among the rank and file is deadened, and where the men are made to move obedient to the interests and the dictates of the capitalists.

When we moved in that direction, we came across two theories. One set of men said to us: "Why, give it up; don't bother with the union." These were usually the "intellectuals." They said: "The union is rotten; it is a vanishing thing." "No," said we, "it is not a vanishing thing; it is a rotten thing, but the skeleton remains." It is with these unions, as with the seals in the Probyoff Islands. The seal-catchers don't go out in pursuit of the seals. They know that at certain seasons the seals gather of themselves at certain spots. At such seasons the hunters are ready at the given places, club in hand; and when the seals turn up, hit them over the head and control of those skeletons of trade unions. They wait for the season when the working men, moved by a revolutionary impulse, demand higher wages and better times. Then come these labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, and with their capitalist clubs, hit this revolutionary movement over the head, by leading it into the ground, like the lightning rod does with the lightning. The theory of "dropping" the union would not do.

The other theory suggested was: "Bore from within." And we tried it. We went into the unions and bored from within. We tried to teach the class struggle. One division, in which I was active myself, was in the K. of L. We struggled and we struggled with the labor lieutenants of the capitalists; it came to hand to hand encounters; finally, we landed on the outside.

While this was the experience or fate of one division of "Borers from Within" the experience and fate of another division, the division that opposes us to-day, was this: By little and little their voices were extinguished. An illustration of that is found in the Progressive Union of Cigar-makers No. 50 of New York. It was said to be the Socialist Union par excellence in the land. It went into the International Union; it was going to bore from within. It was going to teach Socialism. By little and little there was less and less of its voice heard. To-day even within its own organization, Republican leaders are elected to represent it, and they dare not remove them—(Applause)—and as far as their national organization is concerned, not a voice is heard on the part of the borers from within against the economic and other outrages that are being committed. "Boring from within" resolved itself accordingly, into this: either you must bore to a purpose, and then you land quickly on the outside; or you don't land on the outside, but you knuckle under, a silent supporter of the felonies committed by the labor lieutenants of capitalism. Such was the experience.

In Wisconsin there was a strike of the wood carvers in the McMillan shop. One of the benchmen of that shop clubbed one of the strikers and killed him. The revolutionary pulse was felt throughout the land. What became of it? One of the vice-presidents of the A. F. of L., the National Secretary of these very woodworkers, called the strikers together, and says: "Men, be cool, be calm; McMillan is a good employer, he is a kind man; forget what has happened." This is of record in his own journal—cannot be denied.

See what happened with the boiler makers. There was in the Senate of the U. S. a bill for the eight hour day by the A. F. of L. Senator Elkins kills that bill, speaks and votes against it. Thereupon the boiler makers go about and make speeches for Elkins, calling him a good employer. Why? Because he had a ship subsidy bill that would throw some jobs into their hands. Obey Elkins, that branch of the A. F. of L. stood up against the rest of them. For the sake of what they might get, or imagined they could get, they were willing to stand by the man who had killed this eight hour day measure.—This is also on record.

Take another instance. There is in New York a union of the Cabinet

makers, a German organization, said to be a Socialist organization par excellence. It goes into the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, and it is barely in there, when articles begin to reach in that journal of theirs denouncing the Socialist movement, denouncing Socialism and throwing obliquely upon Karl Marx. Whenever I feel that I am calumniated, I think of those articles. Why, they have not begun to say about me what they said about Marx in that journal. Did any one ever hear an answer, a protest to that from the borers from within? The journal is clear of that.

Take this other instance of the cigar-makers. When their employers wanted a tariff reduction, they passed resolutions in the interest of their employers for a tariff reduction, and thereby put themselves diametrically opposed to the employees of those employers who needed rather a high tariff. While that was going on, did any one ever hear a single voice against that on the part of the borers from within in their own journal?—Never!

"Boring from within" was but a blind for the theory of "dropping" the union. Boring from within meant to throw up the sponge, sheathe the sword, and become a traitor to the working class. Boring from within meant that you had to keep quiet, and get the applause of the labor fakir, so that he might do what he wanted to.

Take two instances that are palpitating now in the United States. It is a well known fact that the Cuban cigar-makers get the highest wages among the cigar makers. That fact is not agreeable to the employers. It is a well known fact that the employers have always endeavored to get those Cuban cigar-makers to join the International Union, so that while they would still be paying "union wages," they would, in the point of fact, pay the Cubans lower wages. A bloody conflict is now on in Tampa, Fla. With the connivance of the capitalists, the local branch of the International Union of Cigar-makers has fired shots into the Cuban organization of cigar makers. That strike is obedient to the interests of the employers. Their labor lieutenants are managing it so as to compel these men of the La Resistencia organization to come into the International Union, and when they get into the International Union, then the employers can pay them "union wages," and yet pay them less than they get now. Have you heard a single one of those who claim that "boring from within" is the right thing raise the voice of indignation against that crime against the workers, against that obsequious obedience to the dictates of the capitalists? I have not heard it.

Take the instance of the machinists. The machinists wanted shorter hours, and agitated for that. The employers finally found that they could not pretend not to hear, and said: "We grant you two hours a week,"—and thereupon posted notices whereby they take off five minutes here and ten minutes yonder, five minutes in this place and ten minutes in the other place, so that after all, out of the two hours alleged to be granted, fully one hour and a half are taken away, and you know what that means—that the other half hour has to go with them. But for the labor lieutenants in the International Machinists' Union that thing could not go on. The rank and file of the machinists would have discovered it. The capitalists needed these labor lieutenants to pull the wool over the eyes of the working men. The capitalists themselves could no do it, consequently they call upon the O'Connells and Warners and the rest of their labor lieutenants and officers of that union, the Organized Scabbery of that union, and these call meetings, and advise the men to accept the proposition as a "victory," claiming that "the two hours have been granted." In the midst of that what did the men who wanted to bore from within say? Not a word. If they attempted to rise, the labor lieutenants and their sub-lieutenants would jump at them, would call them scabs, and they are afraid of being called names, so consequently they keep quiet.

Upon these facts and these principles, the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party organized the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. It said, these unions cannot be ignored, nor can they be bored from within exclusively. They must be battered to pieces from without. The bulk of the working men are disorganized because they have made sad experience with these organizations that are controlled by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. The unorganized men we try to organize into the Alliance, and with their aid try to reform those unions, and bring them over. In the pursuit of this policy, of course, there is war. You cannot establish a national organization like the S. T. & L. A. and have the A. F. of L. and the K. of L., or what there is left of it, in a league that means friendship. They immediately began to denounce, and the S. T. & L. A. has marched upon those forces, and its conduct, undeniable by any truthful or self-respecting man, has been this: It organizes the working men; in any conflict between the workingman and the capitalist, (whether the working man is within the Alliance or disorganized entirely on the outside, or organized in the pure and simple union, if there is a real conflict, the Alliance stands by those men, regardless of the organization, as it has done in more than one instance. If, however, the conflict is a conflict between labor and capital in appearance only, where the working men are being used as food for cannon, obedient to some stock jobbing enterprise, or where the labor fakirs are doing for the employers what they cannot do for themselves in the Union, as now in the case of the machinists, then we of the S. T. & L. A. say that it would be a betrayal of the interests of the working class to keep quiet and get the applause, the friendship, or the approval of these labor lieutenants. Then say we, as we are saying in the case of this conflict in Tampa, as in this case of the machinists: "Workingmen, you are being cheated, you are being deceived by the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class." While we are doing that, of course we are being covered with calumnies. But this movement depends upon men, and not upon easily frightened children. As the sun will break through the darkest clouds, so will the correct course, the integrity, the purity of the Alliance shine across all the clouds of calumny that are being hurled against it. We organize the men, we combat these pure and simple organizations, and expect to make them surrender. Already one of them, the wagonmakers, came within eight or twelve votes of surrendering. Others may not surrender, and will have to be taken by storm. These pure and simple organizations are forts in the hands of the capitalist class because these forts are held by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. These forts must be captured; they cannot be wheeled into line for the working class.

There are just three theories with regard to the trades union. One theory is held by those who absolutely oppose the Socialist movement. They say the union is quite enough. All the good that there is in the world, from bicycles up to star showers in the November midnight sky, everything is due to the union. I have not spent any time with that theory. Should it be deemed necessary, I might take it up later.

The other theory is either "bore from within," or "abandon the union" which means the same thing. I have shown you what it amounts to. The third theory is that of the Alliance; that boring from within, with the labor fakir in possession, is a waste of time, and that the only way to do is to stand by the workingmen always. To organize them, enlighten them, and whenever a conflict breaks out in which their brothers are being fooled and used as food for cannon, to have the S. T. & L. A. throw itself in the midst of the fray, and sound the note of sense.

In pursuit of this policy we have anxiously, I for one, looked for an argument against our position. To this day I have not heard one. All that I have heard is calumnious charges against the Alliance. In that yielding the floor to my opponent, who, I understand, is to bring arguments, if he brings any they will be the first I have ever heard, and no one will listen to him more attentively than myself. (Great applause.)

HARRIMAN:

The propositions that are laid down by the opposition are that the class struggle should be recognized by the trades union movement, and that political action should be its mode of procedure. Now, that is not the question before this audience for discussion. It is not a question of political action. All Socialists endorse independent political action on the part of working men. The question before this audience to-day—and I do not quote it correctly, I wish the chairman would call my attention to it—is, "Resolved that the tactics of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance against pure and simple trades unionism is for the benefit of the working class, and for the promotion of Socialism in America." (Great Applause.) Never mind. That will not be credited to me, that time. Now it is not a question of opposing political action, but a question of opposing the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism. This is the proposition before us, and nothing else.

What are the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism? What are they? They were not told here to-night. We were told that political action is their tactics. Very well. That is not the tactics against trade unionism, for a man might be in favor of political action, and yet not oppose old line trade unionism. Not at all. He might endeavor to add political action to the tactics; not oppose trade unionism, but add that as another weapon of their warfare. What now are the tactics? In Mr. De Leon's paper of March 4th he says: "Of course the S. L. P. is opposed to the kind of trade unionism that are retailed over the Gompers' counter." (Laughter)—Now let us look just

one moment further—but fortunately for the working class there is another kind of trades unionism." That is, he is opposed to it, or to pure and simple trade unionism—he wants the other kind—he is opposed, not necessarily to the fakirs, but to trade unionism. All right. Let's follow it up. I will go just one moment further, and before I do, I will mention—(Applause)—after I come a little further—(Applause)—I will mention only one of the unions to which he has referred. (Great Applause.)

In the national convention of the S. L. P. one of the speakers made this remark in a discussion, in a page article—and another page article is filled with the same proposition and similar arguments—(Applause)—he says: "We ought not to attempt to keep in existence that thing which we are fighting to keep out of existence. No, we call upon the Socialists of the United States to get out of the pure and simple organizations, and to smash them to pieces." Mark you, it is a "smash" of the old line trade unionism "to pieces." (Laughter.) Now, those are the tactics against us—"to smash it to pieces."

Now let us see if their actions corroborate their words. Let us see if that is theory or practice. The gentleman has spoken of a number of trade unions—the coal miners in Pennsylvania, the miners in Tennessee, the wood workers of Wisconsin, the furniture makers of New York, the cigar-makers of New York, and others. I will not go into all of them. I will take one. One is sufficient. I would be willing to go into all if there were time to do it. One is enough. I will take the Cigar-makers, for instance. (Laughter, applause and yells.) Hold on there. He says the facts concerning the Davis cigar factory are these: that Honest and Modest, both of the International Union, called the shop to a meeting and had the question of strike discussed, whereupon, by an overwhelming vote, the shop decided not to strike. First the meeting was not called by Honest. He was not present, and Mr. De Leon knows he was not present. He won't deny this. (Applause.) Furthermore, when, on the second meeting these men were present, there was no vote taken. Why was there no vote taken? The gentleman says, whenever hunger or needs or similar motives prompted the need, the gentlemen in the strike committee business would make a raid upon the workers in some cigar factory, ordering them out on strike. He never calumnies, does he? (Laughter and yells.) "The upshot was always the same. Initiation and other dues were scooped in, strike committee salaries were made and the workers were sold out." Now let me look at that just for a minute. First, the strike was called in order to sell the men out and take in the dues. That was the purpose. The International Cigar-maker's constitution provides that no reduction of wages shall be permitted, unless the facts are submitted to the entire union the country over, and when they get their assent, then that local union or shop may accept the reduction, and not until then. He will not deny that fact when he takes the platform after me. Mr. Davis, in his petition for an injunction against the union, said that he was compelled to reduce the bill of prices—the wages—in order to continue his business. Then they submitted the matter to the union, and the petition for a strike came back, and in those court papers, which I am sure Mr. De Leon knows of, Mr. Davis spoke of the strike permission given to them. He will not deny this. Now, since he was compelled to reduce the wages, according to his own allegation; since the men submitted the matter to the unions, and since the unions by a vote ordered the strike—I ask you, what becomes of the statement that they did it simply to sell out the strike and rake in dues? They were compelled to do it or they would have been expelled from the union for not ordering the strike. And when the second meeting came up, they went in there and told those 200 men that there would be a strike because the shop had not the control over the lowering of wages; the entire craft was interested in the lowering of wages and that the union at large had ordered the strike and they commanded them out. What happened? 200 men walked out and about sixty men went back to scab it. (Snickers.) The large majority came out. Now Mr. De Leon says that they organized the shop from top to bottom. (De Leon: I said nothing of the sort.) In your paper, yes, of course, yes. Yes. All right. (Laughter and applause.) It was lucky I had the paper. (Laughter.) He says that they organized it from top to bottom. Now, mark you, about twenty-five of them went back and those twenty-five—a portion of them—were Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance men. A portion of them signed an affidavit and joined with Davis against the court to grant an injunction against the union, and upon the affidavit of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance men and Mr. Davis jointly, they granted the injunction against the working class, the cigar-makers of New York. He will not deny that. He will not deny that. (De Leon: Yes I will.) He will not deny that. Furthermore, now, why I brought this case up is this: to show to you men that in this cigar-makers' strike, Mr. De Leon had united with Davis to scab it on the union; they united with Davis in order to make the affidavit and get the injunction against the union. Allegedly, he organized those scabs, they went back, and Mr. Davis alleges that they were willing to work for the reduction in wages, and in the injunction he alleges this, and they joined with him asking for the injunction. Immediately after the organization of this, the following advertisement appears in the papers.

"Wanted on handwork, jobs from \$9.25 to \$14. Pioneer Cigar-makers' Alliance of S. T. & L. A." (Voice from a left hand box: "Mention the paper!") (Harriman continues) "Samuel I. Davis, 520-522 E. Eighty-first street. (Voice again: "Mention the paper.") Harriman pretends not to hear. (Voice again: "Mention the paper.") Harriman hesitatingly examines paper.) It is the N. Y. "Journal" of March 3. (Hisses: a voice: "a capitalist paper," applause.) Hold on there. It was your advertisement. What does it mean? He said to you here this evening that whenever the working class, whether in the S. T. & L. A. or not, whether organized or whether members of the old unions, were in a struggle, that if they were justified, they united with those men in battle, and I say that here was a case where they were justified, because the Cigar-makers' Union, according to their constitution, called the strike. The vast majority walked out and the S. T. & L. A. with the minority, scabbed upon that union and endeavored to break it. (Applause.) This hold-on—this is consistent. This is the effort first, on the part of Davis to lower wages; on the part of your friends to keep pace with your theory of smashing the union in practice and in theory. The practice and the theory tally.

Now what is trades unionism? Is it fakism? Not a bit of it. There may be fakirs in it. You find those things, men, in every organization. How does trade unionism develop? This is the capitalist endeavor to make money by employing the worker, and wages means that the capitalist pays the worker less than the worker produces. Now the less the capitalist pays the worker, the more easily he can gratify his desires by the energy he gets from him, from products that he gets from him. The higher the rate of wages the less the capitalist takes. But when the capitalist decreases the wages until there is so much pain that the working class cannot endure it any longer, they bunch together, and your union is born. There is your union. Now the struggle is on between the two organizations. The union struggles to force its wages up with strike and boycott. Yes. That is pure and simple trades unionism. That is all. It has not yet progressed to political action, but the great mass of men are within the organization struggling to raise the wages, to increase their material interests by the strike and boycott. All Socialists say this is not enough, but all Socialists say that so far as it goes, that is the only method in the capitalist system—so far, I say, as it goes. But when two great organizations, the working class on one hand, the capitalist class on the other, meet in their struggle, they represent great power, and where power develops there the opportunity to a greater or less degree for corruption to develop; but, because some men come and fasten themselves upon a union like a barnacle, they do not necessarily, that is their actions are not necessarily a part of the union, their actions are only brought to bear upon the union, and it would be no more a part of trade unionism than Mr. De Leon's tactics towards them is a part of Socialism. (Applause.) Hold on, not a bit—so that it would be just as foolish to fight the trade union because of their few dishonest men as it would be to fight Socialism because of peculiar tactics. It is not a part of trades unionism. It is a part of the rogue's constitution of working his desires at the expense of his class—not a part of the principles of the movement at all. (Laughter.)

Now just watch it develop a little further. I say the great mass of the working class do not know what Socialism is; they are unacquainted with our philosophy, and that being true, and since Socialism or since trades unionism, is born by the lowering of wages or by economic pressure—if we were to wipe out every trade union on the face of the earth to-day, to-morrow your economic pressure would breed them again and develop them again. You cannot stop them. They are children of your system, born to stay as long as capitalism stays. Now mark you; to fight them means what? They do not know what Socialism is, I say. They come there to benefit themselves, rather to get to raise their wages. Being ignorant of your philosophy, the very moment you attack trade unions and say you are going to smash them to pieces, that moment you attack their means of gaining their

livelihood, that is, their means of preserving and carrying on the fight against the capitalist class, their means of keeping them up—always, mark you this, I say, always necessarily with a downward tendency, and must be. Now then the moment you strike the thing that helps and guards them, the means by which they fight their great enemy, with the capitalist class, that moment you think you are inspiring them, that moment you arouse their antagonism, that moment you inspire their hatred and you divide your men into two hostile camps, the trades union movement on the one side and you, S. L. P. and S. T. & L. A., on the other, and there the workingmen, fight like cats and dogs, while all their power is being sapped, fighting over the policy, fighting over a difference, merely because, that they are dishonest, I say to you that the hundreds of thousands of men in the trades unions are not dishonest—that there are a few, yes, that there are a few in this movement, yes, but that doesn't condemn your movement because they are dishonest. (Applause.) Now, you see, all this divides them into two hostile camps. I do not have to tell you men that you are divided, that you are divided here to-night. You are fighting each other to-night, and you are all Socialists fighting over a difference in a trade union policy, and that is all. You are fighting to the end, and it is this policy that has divided you.

Furthermore, it has divided their party themselves, for in 1896 the S. T. & L. A. split, and in 1899—(to De Leon) don't look surprised. (De Leon) I don't look surprised. Your memory is failing you. In 1899 the S. L. P. split—didn't look up surprised that time—and it split upon this policy, upon the policy the difference between the S. T. & L. A. policy against the trades union movement. We fought over it and we split on it. Why? Because we knew that to follow the policy meant to array the working class against Socialism by incorrect tactics. What did we do? We look at them and we say, the Social Democratic party to-day, which to-day contains the majority of the S. L. P.—he will not say a majority, but I will say a large majority in the United States—but we split, our conventions about equal size, and we fought over this particular difference—we say to-day, that if you would enter the union with all your members—he says we did and we were weak when we were struggling for the control of the union. Ah! Were you weak? Then you should have waited until you were strong. (Laughter.) How could you hope to gain the control of a trade union movement when you were weak and when the vast majority of the members of the trade unions didn't know what you wanted. I say, we tell you you are making a mistake. Go into your union; when a strike comes on, espouse the cause of the union, take up the fight of the union, make their interests your interests, and when you do, you will find that they will open their ears to every argument that promises a benefit and a means to further their ends. Then they will listen to your arguments on political action. You say, No, no; we have tried. Well, I say, Yes, yes; we have tried it; and let me assure you we have tried it in dead earnest. I do not make this statement because I think they do not know it. Here are some facts.

I do not take my own literature. I always prefer to prove the case against the opposition by their own literature. (Laughter.) Here is a part of it. In their debate upon this famous resolution was passed: "If any member of the S. L. P. accepts office in a pure and simple trade or labor organization, he shall be considered antagonistic to the S. L. P. and shall be expelled"—the S. L. P. and the S. T. & L. A. are identical in this wish—"but if any officer of a pure and simple trade or labor organization applies for membership in the S. L. P., he shall be rejected." Here is a very interesting little statement here. Now this first is from Kuhn. Kuhn opposed that their National Secretary—of the S. L. P. He says: "It has been my experience with a number of correspondents of mine who are organizers of Sections of the S. L. P., that they were at the same time officers of such unions." I mean by that that they were to work from within, that it is possible. Now, mark you—"Comrade Meyer himself for a long time"—author of the resolution I just read—"was an officer of such a union." It is possible, isn't it? (Laughter.) "Hammond, for instance, was, for many years, I think, an officer in the Typographical local in Minneapolis"—it is possible, isn't it?—"another comrade, one of our best men in Brooklyn, a man, one of the most active men, was also a member, hem, hem, (applause), hem, (great applause), hem, a man, hem, hem, (great applause), and president of the Carpenters' Union in Brooklyn."

Furthermore, let us take Teche's statement. I want to show you that it is possible. "As far as I am personally concerned," Teche says—"one of the men who spoke in this national convention"—I am heartily in sympathy with the sentiments spoken, but I believe at the same time there is such a thing as pulling the strings a little too tight, to run a little too fast, and I believe with Comrade Kuhn that circumstances alter cases in many instances. I will give you an instance in my own case. I have belonged to a trade union ever since I came to this country and belonged to the same in the old country, a small concern, only about, say, ninety men in the whole country left of us in the whole organization. Every officer belongs to our party." It is possible, isn't it? Old tried and true comrades, remarkable, isn't it? Can't bore from within, can you?—"and I can further point out that in percentage of members who are Socialists and collections made, there is no organization in this country that can come up to it, especially if we take into consideration the wages we have been earning. If the resolution goes through without any further ado, all of us must resign, and we flatter ourselves that we have elevated our union." Don't you see you can work inside the union if you know how to do it? (Laughter.) Here was a man who knew how. I will leave that one then and go on to the next one, although it continues on that line. Well, I go ahead—"at the same time to try to bring that organization into the S. T. & L. A. is impossible"—couldn't do that—"although the majority of us are Socialists"—according to his own statement.

Now here comes another one, which is very important—"I believe if this motion goes through as it is before us, it will mean that those men who are to-day presidents secretaries and financial secretaries, whether they have any salary or not makes no difference," he says—all of them, there are a whole lot of them around the country—it is possible—all of them—"it means that they will have to step out of their offices and take their places on the floor"—Now mark you, here is the important point—"I believe that it will be the best means of swinging the whole organization into the S. T. & L. A."

Do you not see that the arguments prove one thing above all others, that boring within is possible, and you can bore within and gain the confidence of the union. The gentleman upon this platform cannot go to the trade union people of which he spoke, the Cigarmakers' Union in New York, because of their action and get any hearing whatever before the members there because of the action. I say to you men that the possibility of boring within is infinite in its scope. Because you work with the laborers in their struggles and in their struggles and when they are in their fight and the party backs them in their struggles, you open their ears not only to political action, but to the philosophy that lies behind the political action, behind the political action that is taught; and all over the country everywhere there are to-day unions taking up the proposition of the collective ownership of the means of production. I can cite to you the Central Federation of Labor in New York, the Cleveland Central Labor Union Constitution, and they both provide for the collective ownership and independent political action. Simply because those who have been patient and who have worked within have gained the confidence of the people, they have listened to them, and they have gained an advantage by gaining a hearing before those men.

Now the vast majority of the people in the trade unions vote upon the laws of the trade union. They elect their men, they make their laws for the members by a popular vote, not by the vote of the officers, and I maintain that the laws of the trade union organization are due, in the nature of independent political action, to the ignorance of those members upon this point and not to their wilful dishonesty. If they are wilfully dishonest, on purpose, you might as well give up the entire fight, for why should you argue with dishonest men? But if they are honest and do not know, then we can come in among them, espouse their cause, gain their confidence, and they will listen to our doctrines upon political action, independent political action, and by this means we will be able to induce them to add to the boycott and the strike the ballot as a further weapon to gain their ends, for with the ballot in their hands they are all-powerful. But, if you arouse antagonism, you can't get the ballot in their hands.

I deny that the unions are controlled by a few men. Take for instance the International Brotherhood of Engineers. Our friend told us three years ago that they were destroyed wasted the substance of 49 years of existence. To-day after that struggle they are more powerful than ever before. Eighty-four thousands belong to them. They have a million and a half dollars in reserve fund, and it only shows that though they may have been temporarily crushed, yet the capitalist system will produce the union again, and if they are not Socialists, if the Socialist propaganda has not reached them, it will simply make the same old union over again, and all your fight is for nothing. (Great applause and cheers.)

DE LEON—I hope the intended insult upon your intellect has not escaped you. The arguments of the gentleman who has just consumed three minutes were partly devoted to statements I did not make at all, and that were no part of my argument. (Laughter and applause.) He had to put up a straw man of his own. I cannot blame him, as his case is a bad one. (Laughter.) The other part of his answer was to try to foist upon me a straw man of his own. I did not say, as was falsely imputed to me, that the point was a rule to get the rank and file to vote. I did not cross the political line. I stated that as to the ideal, and then I went on to something else. He crossed the political line. I may have time, ten minutes, at the end to take that up. What I did say was that in the economic struggle the aspirations of the working men run into the ground by the labor lieutenants of the capitalist. All that he said about trying to give them the ballot had nothing

to do with the case. We try to have the workingmen improve their condition NOW. I tried to make that clear enough, and I maintained and I argued that the conditions of the workers could not be improved NOW, despite the labor fakir argument we have just heard. Their condition cannot be improved so long as they are controlled by the labor lieutenants of capital; and I stated why: because every time these men proceed to do something in their own behalf as in the case of the machinists to-day, the labor lieutenants will see to it that they are deceived; and he, venturesome though he was, did not dare to deny that these machinists are being deceived now, and that the alleged two hours granted to them is a swindle upon them, and that swindle is practiced upon them by the aid of the labor lieutenants of capital, and the press of the "borders from within."

His other insult to you was to make out that I said that the rank and file were dishonest. Oh, what eloquence did we hear—regular pulpit eloquence on the subject. Clear enough I stated that the rank and file were earnest in their attempt to improve their condition, and they are surely honest in that desire. Who is there here who could have understood me otherwise, and that does not know that it could not possibly be imputed to me that I said that the rank and file were dishonest? The other insult perpetrated upon you was to quote the speech of Comrade Teche, who has a little bit of a union under entirely exceptional circumstances. He concealed the facts to you, and then gave you Teche's speech, as though the status of his union were a general thing, and he proceeded to quote some other exceptional instances on the point of officers. An intelligent man, a man who is not talking for a snap victory, a man who respects his cause, doesn't build upon exceptions: he takes the rule. I quoted instances of not little, petty unions like Teche's organization. I quoted the woodworkers, of thousands of them; quoted the cigarmakers of thousands of them; quoted the machinists, of thousands of them; quoted the boiler-makers, of thousands of them—unions of power, numerically, however slight their power to improve their condition, and that they were run into the ground by the labor lieutenants of capital, as is happening now with the machinists.

Another insult to your intelligence. (Snickers from Kangaroos.) You will laugh the wrong side of your mouths one of these days. I have seen Democratic crowds of workingmen who laughed at me once. They don't laugh now. Another insult to your intelligence was to pretend to make an argument against my position that attacked the boring from within; and in what did that charge consist? In repeating charges started by our adversaries, and which I here want to say are a falsehood from beginning to end. I mean the Davis affair. But I want to grant, for the sake of argument, that the charge is true. What would you say of a man who stood before you and denied that Socialism was right, and instead of attacking the theory of Socialism were to quote Millerand who remains in the French cabinet, a Socialist in a cabinet that shoots workingmen; or who were to cite Mr. Harriman himself, whose organization in California applies for capitalist political jobs? (Great applause, hisses.) Or, as a man I know of did on one occasion, quote some Socialist who bent his wife and says: "Is that Socialism? Then I don't want any of it." That sort of argument is an insult.

Even if what is charged did happen at Davis's, it would be a wrongful act; it could not overthrow a principle. But (and our stenographer is present) those "facts" I here nail as absolutely false from beginning to end. There was no International Union at Davis's; IT WAS AN OPEN SHOP. His men were called out by the labor lieutenants of capital. (Applause and hisses.) Ah, hiss all you like. His men were called out by two members of the Organization Scabbery. Knowing these worthies, they voted against going out. It was not, in such cases, necessary to take a vote of the whole International Union. The shop crew decided not to strike; consequently there was no strike in the shop. A few indeed some of them, or many, went out under the threat of these labor lieutenants of capital that they would be scabs—so much the worse for their manliness. But the facts as they were presented here to-night are absolutely false.

THE PEOPLE was quoted. When I said "I didn't say that," my words were twisted into one of his tricks. I presumed the gentleman claimed that I used that in my argument. Whatever is in the PEOPLE I stand by in every respect. But he didn't say anything after all that to justify that quotation, and I wondered what it was going to be all about.

He claimed that I did not come to the theory of the Alliance. The theory of the Alliance is that the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class—based upon those illustrations that I have furnished you from the large unions, not little, pignums, Teche unions that he tried to make you believe by quotations amount to something—that these lieutenants of labor prevent the rank and file from doing anything in their own behalf. I showed the deterioration of the working class and their economic decline, notwithstanding a large trades union movement. And I showed you how we did try to "bore from within" and how that failed; and I proved that their "boring from within" amounts to nothing but a pretence. Their "boring from within" means to "talk" Socialism. Oh, yes, send a man to a pure and simple trades union to "talk" Socialism in the abstract; he is welcome; that adds prestige of the Organized Scabbery that runs the union. But if a strike is started by the capitalists in that trade through their labor lieutenants, and you attempt to open your mouth and show the workingmen that they are being betrayed, why, that is something else—that would not be the "talking" of "abstract Socialism," that no one cares anything about, anymore. That hurts the Organized Scabbery. That is not tolerated. And the present "borders from within" "bore" by bowing in submission. We claim that it is the duty of the honest and energetic Socialists to call the attention of the masses to it every time they are being cheated. And we charge these borders from within, as we prove it now in the instance of the machinists, that in their papers they say not a word against it, on the contrary, they are whooping it up for the fakirs, as they did here to-night, claiming for an organization that has millions of dollars when it has not got it; claiming for it to have 80,000 members, when it has not got it; claiming for it a victory, which is a fraud, and a snare, and a delusion to the workers. Of course, such "borders from within" can be heard; of course, they will get resolutions in their behalf; but the rank and file of the workingmen will continue declining, urged on in their decline by the conduct of these so-called Socialists. The attitude of the Alliance is that the duty of the Socialist is to be with the working class in all its working-class endeavors, and that it is the bounden duty of every Socialist to have his voice heard clear, loud, emphatic—notwithstanding all the lies uttered against him; notwithstanding all the calumnies that Scabbery may hurl at his head—that they utter clearly what is going on and teach the working people what it is they are being run into doing; how, in each one of these cases, the working people are being used for food for cannon for the capitalist class.

We are told that upon that line little progress can be made. Well, I believe so, too, comparatively little, but we do not believe in a progress that is deceptive. We do not believe in progress except in progress that is progress. We do not believe in being able to say "so and so many unions have endorsed us," with over 50,000 members in New York; and coming out with a paltry seven or eight thousands votes. We do not believe (laughter and applause) that that is progress. On the contrary, we believe that whatever progress is made must be made by education.

I remember the time when the S. L. P. started its career on the political field. Among the very men who now denounce our trade union attitude were those who denounced us then for denouncing the Democratic and Republicans "too severely." We were "antagonizing the labor leaders!" A political party was established, and yet they did not want to have any "trouble," any "inconvenience." So I look now over their journals from beginning to end, and the rascality of the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class can be seen in all of their journals, without exception, to go by unreprieved, uncondemned. Nay, worse; every time that the capitalist wants to run down the revolutionary pulse of the workingmen—run it into the ground, as in this case of the machinists, by telling bogus pious stories about bogus "victories," thus repeating the language of the capitalist—every such time we find these "borders from within" acting as veritable hand-maids of these capitalists and of these labor lieutenants of capital.

The work may be slow; the work is arduous; but arduous, indeed, is the course of the Socialist movement. Arduous, indeed, is the course of the educator. The gentlemen who talk and believe as Mr. Harriman, believe in an "education" that runs away from the people you ought to attack. They believe in an "education" that consists in whooping it up for the enemy. They believe in an "education" that helps the capitalist rivet ignorance upon the workingmen—that is the sort of "progress" that they advocate. Whereas the policy of the S. T. & L. A. is to go slow, gather these men in hold up the clear principle. If a wrong is done to a union if the rank and file is being deceived, why, then, even if that whole rank and file rises against you and denounces you, stand your ground; stand it—because the day will come when that rank and file will remember that YOU told them the truth; then, also, will they remember the men who "bored from within," who acted as prostitutes for the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. Then will you find progress; then will it come with rapid strides, for that real work has been noted. Unless there is real work back of it, there is no progress worth mentioning.

For the rest, I can say that—unless some new argument is made; unless the gentleman has reserved for his next thirty minutes the real argument, that is to say, not the citing of exceptional cases, but arguments based upon general facts, to show how "boring from within" could make progress—I shall be able to withdraw from this debate, when it ends, satisfied that the cause of the S. T. & L. A. is the correct one. I have heard to-night identically what I have been hearing for the last four years. They first start with calumny upon calumny; one fellow invents it and the others ricklessly repeat it. We mention the facts from their own journals; they shut their eyes to that. As to argument—they are remarkably silent.

The gentleman referred to a split in the S. T. & L. A. and I looked

surprised; and he was surprised at my surprise. (Laughter.) I did not imagine that he would put his foot into that hole. Yes, there was a "split." The Central Labor Federation, which he has quoted here like a sweet morsel, had a souvenir. In that souvenir it printed advertisements of the capitalist parties during a campaign—very much like the other papers, or some of them in New York, of the "borders from within." Thereupon a noise was made against the man, Bohm, who, as secretary of the Federation, had charge of the souvenir, and was also general secretary of the S. T. & L. A. To go into these facts is almost painful, for the reason that it is time spent in stating things that every body should know by this time. The General Executive Board of the S. T. & L. A. held up Bohm. His excuse was that he knew nothing about it, that his partner did it—which was possible; an honest man may be deceived by a wicked partner. We waited and said to him: "If, indeed, your partner cheated you, then you must separate from your partner p. d. q." We waited and waited, waited and waited. Then the Convention of the Alliance met, and I rose during that convention and asked him: "Are you still in partnership with that man?" At that convention, "borders from within" to-day, one man from Chicago rose and objected to the question and Bohm refused to answer. Thereupon I voted "No" to his re-election as Secretary of the Alliance, together with his Central Labor Federation that backed him, having been branded there as really guilty of the crime of putting capitalist advertisements in a labor publication. Just as soon as the Central Labor Federation was in a labor publication. Just as soon as the Central Labor Federation was in a labor publication, "borders from within" took him up with open arms and the Central Labor Federation which they denounced before, suddenly became a pure thing that was "boring from within" to their heart's content. The Alliance fired this Federation pack. That was the "split." It was the split that takes place when you grab a rascal, and kick him out of the house. Of course, the rascal falls in with the other rascals where he belonged. (Great applause, hisses.)

I wish to dispose of another point. It is this: The claim that it was a great mistake on our part to start educating when we did and should have waited till we were "strong in the unions." Of course, there is one thing that he omitted to state in his course of misrepresenting my argument. He omitted to state that we should "not have started in with insisting that the men should vote for the S. L. P." That was not our line of work. What we wanted was to redeem them from capitalist influence on the economic field, so that they could have something right away. We should have waited till we were strong; that is, a man should wait till he can swim before he goes into the water. (Laughter.) Wait until all the men are converted to Socialism, then start to educate them!! (Laughter.) We went into the unions, and when the labor fakir came there with capitalist propositions, we rose and tried to teach the rank and file. The rank and file—not through dishonesty, indeed not—the rank and file could not take our views; didn't dare to take our views, because in most of these unions there is a system of blackmail and browbeating that the labor leaders exercises upon the men. For the sake of keeping their jobs, for the sake of not losing their sick and death benefit advantages, the men caved in; and when the labor fakir gave the signal, those men voted as the labor fakir dictated. Finally, when we were driving the labor fakir to the corner the split came. The conscientious borders from within then landed on the outside, and have continued to bore from the outside, with the assistance of which alone can simultaneous boring from within be effective. On the other hand, those who stayed there, "preserving the full sympathy of these unions," what have they got to congratulate themselves with, except candy sacks, resolutions that mean nothing, resolutions for "collective ownership," resolutions this way and that way—while in the meantime, every practical attempt on the part of the rank and file to improve itself continues to be run into the ground, the men divided among themselves, according as the capitalist interests of their various employers may dictate. (Great applause, hisses.)

HARRIMAN—I am surprised to hear the gentleman speak so frequently of being abused, so much of calumny, when he first takes up the unions one after the other and says that the men active in those unions are all in the pay of the capitalist class or under the influence of the capitalists. What is that but calumny? When he referred to the statements that I made on the Cigarmakers' Union—and you will observe that he carefully steered clear of that Cigarmakers' Union case excepting he said the whole thing is false, the whole thing is a lie—then he said, referring to us, as giving ourselves as prostitutes to the capitalist class, in order to rivet their influence upon the trade union movement, and yet he is a man that doesn't believe in calumny. (Laughter.) What a clean, white tongue he has. I will try my hand a little. Let me show you. I will read to you here. I will not call him a liar. No, I will read to you something else and will let the facts talk a little.

Mr. Davis alleged that it was the purpose of the union to raise the wages, that he was compelled to lower the price and that those that remained with him were willing to work for the lower price, and Mr. De Leon said in the paper of March 11, which I have here, that they had a contract for two years—by the agreement there made, which holds for two years, the shop is to be an Alliance shop. Now Davis alleged in his affidavit for an injunction—which I have here, which Mr. De Leon says is false, and I will read a little to you—he says that the men working there were willing to work for less and willing to work for lower wages, and that he paid an enormous sum for new workmen, because they were keeping the men from coming to work, and the men belonging to the S. T. & L. A. said they were being kept away, interfered with as they came to work, and Mr. De Leon says he had a contract for two years. How much did you get for the job? (Great applause, yells, storm of hisses, a thrill of indignation goes through the audience. Harriman, aside: "I mean that.")

I would not have called Mr. De Leon a liar had he not called me one first. This is only a fire at him from his own guns.

He first says, How will they dare stay on the floor of the union if they are radical? How will they dare join the S. T. & L. A.? It is the same argument.

He says, We do not want to go in the water until we learn to swim. That is, he suggests that it is my statement. What I told them was to wait while they are in the water and they should have stayed there till they learned how to swim. (Laughter.)

He proposes to rivet upon the capitalist class—he said upon the working class—the influence of the capitalist class. When he finds trade unions in New York that will not listen to Socialism because they scab upon the unions, will those unions not give their support to the very men who oppose Socialism, so long as the men themselves, the membership, do not understand Socialism? If you fight the union, you do the very thing that rivets the matter, that rivets the power of the dishonest man upon the union, because he gains his power by reason of their not understanding the Socialist philosophy. You must make them understand, or you will never make any headway, and because I say that, he speaks of a few little unions. Then I brought this affidavit, which he says is a lie. I will refer to this union. He says that I refer to a few little unions that have no membership. I spoke of the Amalgamated Engineers. He says they are weak. I have here their journal; it comes monthly; and here it shows \$2,000 members, and here is their official report (holding up a paper), showing \$1,500,000 in the treasury. He cannot deny it. Here are the facts. He may say it is a false statement of facts, but every year, and sometimes semi-annually, if there is a weak union and there is a strong union which has more than its pro rata, they have that money adjusted; they have an equalization method, and they put so much money in the treasury, not in this country, but all over the world, so that every union has an equal amount per capita in its treasury at practically all times, and that equalization prevents a fraudulent statement of facts concerning their finances, for if they said more, then the unions would draw upon them. I say to you that the accusations against those things, the methods of the unions, is overdrawn.

Now, let me look at this. The purposes, furthermore, he speaks of the union. We will start with the Cigarmakers' Union. He says everything I said was a lie, mark you, concerning this Cigarmakers' Union proposition. I told you that the union could not declare a strike, unless they could not avoid declaring a strike on occasions when the scale of wages was lower, unless they got the permission of the entire union. If the wages went down, they must declare a strike, unless directed to the contrary by the union. Here is the constitution—and he denies it.

"Should any local union desire to reduce its bill of prices wherein 75 or more members are involved, the officers of the union or unions shall submit a statement of the facts to the international president giving the reasons why the bill should be reduced, which application and reasons shall be submitted by the international president to a vote of all the local unions." Now, it says: "But no strike for an increase of wages"—that is to say, no call—"shall be considered legal unless approved by a two-thirds majority of all votes cast." It is a lie, is it? Who has lied? (Turning to De Leon.) Take your own medicine. (Snickers from Kangaroos.)

Here is another proposition. He says you cannot get upon the floors of the unions and argue the case, because you would be dismissed. Here is a resolution of the Central Federated body of which he is opposed to, because they left him and would not endorse his tactics, and their proposition is this: They resolve in favor of the collective ownership by the people of all the means of production and distribution, of all the means of communication and transportation; that one-half an hour—or one hour and a half—be devoted to discuss economic, social and political questions the first meeting of each month in their central body. Here is your union, here are the constitution and by-laws. Could give you dozens of them, if we only had time this evening to go through them all.

He says we had 50,000 parading with us, and still had a small vote, yet, with all the advantage the gentleman has had in the State of New York, holding the old name and all the agitation, yet we have cast as

many votes as the Socialist Labor Party; they have come with us in a large part, and they were all honest a few years ago, are they all honest now? (Laughter.)

Let us take up this matter, the purpose of the union. Now, One I will run through these so you will see that it was alleged by Mr. Davis himself, Davis says—here is the application for injunction (holds up a paper)—that "the general purpose of the unincorporated association hereinbefore named"—the International Cigarmakers' Union—"are to advance the interests of their members, to reduce and keep down the number of hours per day they would be required to work, to enhance the price of wages and to compel their employers to employ in their business only members of said association." That is a well defined charge to make against a trade union, isn't it?

Now, let us go on, examine this matter as we go through, a little further. On the first day of February, 1900, and for some time prior thereto, the plaintiffs, in the prosecution of such business, had in their employ about 125 cigarmakers and 20 packers, of nationalities other than Spanish or Cuban; about 25 cigarmakers of the Spanish or Cuban nationality, and about 25 strippers of all nationalities. That makes over 200, you see. Cigarmakers of Spanish or Cuban nationality constituted plaintiff plaintiffs toward their "Spanish shop." There was also a German shop, and they both came out. Only about 25 or 30 went back. "On or about January 1, 1900, the people took stock and ascertained the condition of their business, and found that it was impossible to continue upon the basis of the prices fixed in the October agreement." But you that—made an agreement with the union* in October. They broke the contract, they were in the act of breaking the contract when the men began to scab. When the S. T. & L. A. went in and organized that shop, they had broken the agreement, October, and it is in the affidavit. Here are the court papers—broken the agreement. "That then upon the plaintiffs appealed to their said employees and informed them that it was impossible for them to continue in business upon the basis of the scale of wages fixed in said October, 1899, agreement, and informed them that the plaintiffs should be compelled to adopt the scale of wages in force prior to the strike of October, 1899." Said they had to lower them, there was their own statement for it, the statement of Davis. All right. "That thereafter and on February 12, 1900, the employees of the plaintiffs employed in their said Spanish shop, although they had no cause for complaint as to the wages paid to them, were induced or coerced by" hem! hem—the International Union—hem!—"to leave the employ of the plaintiffs." Why? Let me look just a moment. Suppose that of the five or six cigarmaker shops here in this city, suppose a majority belonged to the S. T. & L. A. or to the trade union, and one shop undertook to lower the wages, that shop would not be permitted to determine that, because the lowering of the wages interests the craft, and the craft handles it, and for that reason they made their application to the union and were permitted to strike.

Let us go on a little further here. "On or about Saturday, January 27, 1900 some of the cigarmakers belonging to the department known as our German shop stated to my brother and myself that they heard," hem, hem—and—hem (applause), "that they heard" hem, "they heard" that an application for a strike in our factory had been filed with the Cigarmakers' International Union, and that our cigarmakers intended holding a meeting that day to consider the question whether they would strike or not." Now, you see, the application is here, they would ask for an application before they are permitted to reduce the wages, and the application came, and the order to strike was made not by the committee, but by the International Union, and those men were compelled to order the strike. "I made no objection to the men's attending the meeting." What meeting? Now, mark you, in Mr. De Leon's rape, which he says is a man of straw, because, he says I stand up something to knock down—Why did I do this? Why did I take this stand and show the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trade unionism? Because he didn't, and that is the question this evening, and I am discussing the question, and not whatever he might desire to spring. (Applause.) I am not going to Paris to debate about America. We have many number of national questions. I am discussing the question of the tactics of the S. T. & L. A. against trades unionism and who is acting as an obstacle to the working class. The meeting—"I made no objection to the men's attending the meeting," says Mr. Davis, "and learned subsequently that the meeting had been held, and that the cigarmakers had decided not to strike." That was before, mark you, that the men called the strike. This was the work of the shop, and in this shop where they voted, it was a shop meeting, not a union meeting, a meeting where detectives were placed in order to tell Mr. Davis who had voted for the strike and then he would discharge them, and then go on with his business opposed to the rules of the International Cigarmakers' Union.

Let us see the evidence of that. It follows in the next page like this: "When our hands told me that the second meeting had been called, I requested them and urged them, although some of them expressed themselves as unwilling to do so, to attend the meeting and vote freely upon the questions to be placed before them. I knew from statements that had been made to me by many of my employees, that they were all satisfied to stand by the vote of the Saturday previous"—hem, hem. "The workmen reported to me that they had been prevented from voting." What did I tell you? Certainly; because it was not a shop proposition, and the application had ordered a strike, and it was at this meeting that the men were prevented, and not the former meeting. He cannot deny that fact, here is the statement of it in the affidavit.

Let us go a little further. It is getting a little interesting along here. "As to the manner in which the pending strike took place in my shop, I state that the Cigarmakers' International Union, as represented by the defendants, inaugurated said strike in such a manner as to cause my said firm great and unnecessary loss. In our business of cigarmaking, the wrappers of the cigars are cased each day for the next day's work, that is to say that those wrappers are dipped in water, and because of this these wrappers will only keep for a few days." Then he goes on and tells how many there were—long affidavit—and then states that the strike was brought on in order to damage them and keep a large number of workmen out. Now, I have shown that over 200 struck, and he claims that they damaged the wrappers, and he made that one of the reasons why—and other damage—that the affidavit was made, for, as he says, they remained out and injured them to a large extent and to a large sum.

I'll go on a little further with this and see if we can't find something else. Let me see. Here is one of the most interesting of the points. "I was present at the next meeting of the hands"—the next meeting—"held the following Tuesday, and by orders of the committee representing the International Union we were ordered to strike against our will." These are some of the men who went back, mark you. "I state that I have noticed men standing on the block in front of the factory premises all day, and for every day since the strike was ordered, and these men, the pickets, are still there. They interfere with us going to and going from work, and we join in the request to the court that they be removed and prevented from interfering with us." To that is appended a list of names, and in that list of names are S. T. & L. A. men. One of them, Mr. Mayer, who organized—and was the organizer, I believe, or is officer in—the union, at least an active man in the union. Among them were two, four, six, seven men, who belonged to the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. (Voice from left-hand box: Read their names.) Harriman ignores the request, and the voice repeats the question several times. Chairman threatens to have the individual put out. Finally Harriman reads the names as follows: They have asked me to read the names. They are: Rappaport, Mayers, Ashkenazy, Leibholz, Rappaport again, Rosenthal, Singer. Now, he may deny that these are S. T. & L. A. men—I do not know whether they are or not—but whether he does or not, he acknowledges that on the first of these days which I have read to you, he said in his paper here that the men returned to work, he says, I have shown you that they didn't return to work. He says he didn't say it this evening. Ah, but he said it in his tactics against the union. The Alliance took and organized the shop from top to bottom, and then he says a contract was made for two years; and the very day Mr. Davis is asking the Cigarmakers' Union, which, he says, I desired to go back to work and take their places; and I have been a letter to the Cigarmakers' Union over his own signature, saying: "We should like to have our old hands return to work, and are ready and willing to give all that may apply of such hands, either singly or in a body, employment." (Applause.) There is his letter written to the Cigarmakers' Union, showing that the Cigarmakers' Union was not crucified even though the S. T. & L. A. men did, under the guidance of some of the men in New York, walk in and take the places of the union men who

*In order to make out that the Alliance "scabbed" it at Davis's on the International Union, it was necessary for Mr. Harriman to refute the statement of Mr. De Leon that Davis was an open shop. It was necessary for Harriman to make out that Davis was an International Union shop, with agreement or contract between Davis and the International Union, thus making the International Union with rights and duties there. Mr. Harriman undertakes that job, and how? He reads in a garbled way passages from Davis's affidavit, which Davis had entered into an agreement with his workers, and when Mr. Harriman reaches that point he says: "Mark you that—AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UNION." Not a word, either read from or interpreted into the affidavit, showing that the agreement was with the International Union. Now, then, that agreement was made by Davis expressly with his workers individually, and it expressly excludes all union intervention, international or otherwise. Here is a passage of that agreement pointedly saying so: "That if one or more of our employees are being at any time coerced or otherwise, in order to cause them against their own free will and judgment, join any one or certain labor unions, we shall consider that act as against our interests and not in accordance with the promise or understanding of our list of prices shall therefore be refused to be made and shall be void." Most significant. In this connection, is the fact that the said agreement forms part of the affidavit made by Rosenfeld, the president of the Joint Advisory Board of the International Union, in opposing Davis's affidavit against an injunction, and that the said Rosenfeld affidavit was part of the rolls of paper from which Mr. Harriman was reading. All the affidavit on file in the office of the county clerk.

In this passage the three-card monte game of Mr. Harriman reached its

crowded out because their wages had been lowered, and because a socialist institution had endeavored to break the contract that they had made a few months before. Why do I dwell upon this? Because Mr. Teche said that everything I said concerning it was a lie. These statements that I have read from this affidavit, in request, to get an impression against the trade union. And this is their theory in action! This action is to crush the trade unions.

Now, the gentleman says that I referred to a few small unions. Why? Well, Teche's union, his own union, that they speak of in their paper, the Amalgamated Engineers, why did I refer to them? Because it is not even though you crush a union, whether the capitalist class crushes it, or whether by your tactics you are able temporarily to cheat them out of a victory, by partly organizing it, the conditions will reproduce that union. The conditions will reproduce that union, and you will never be able to make any headway unless you expose the cause of the union, work in among them, gain their confidence, there to teach them the power they have in the ballot, instead of first creating of them enemies and causing the rank and file to refuse to hear your doctrine concerning the philosophy of Socialism.

Now, before I close, when the gentleman tells you that he has proven so and so and so, you may remember whether he has proven so and so or not, and when he tells you that I have admitted this and have admitted that, you may know that I have not admitted anything at all; that I make my own admissions; that when he tells you of a man who is a preacher oratory, you may tell him in your minds that that has nothing to do with the issue. When he tells you about France, when he tells you of Millard and other statements concerning a multitude of unions, we have no time to discuss here, ask him to discuss these things for an injunction and why they went into the shop. (Applause.)

Remember that I admit nothing; remember that we must work with the working class and that we can only work with them by going into their ranks, that we can only gain their confidence by exposing their enemies, that we can only give the grip of those who are dishonest by exposing the rank and file as to the problems of Socialism, and the conditions as long as they stay out of the water (laughter and applause), and he confesses that he means to smash the unions, hundreds of thousands of them, with a little bit of an Alliance. Now look. Is it to be to smash the trade unions, and then go and gather up all the pieces when they are mad, and then convince them of Socialism, and then get them into the S. T. & L. A.? How much more could you go among them without making them mad, expose their cause, convince them of Socialism, then have to gather up the pieces, and cause them to take action along independent political lines. Have not the labor fakirs that speak of, if they are there—and some of them are there, just as they are in all organizations—wherever power concentrates, there corruption develops to a certain extent—get out of the union, do not give them men a new lease of life? Go in and educate your men, do you not realize those who are dishonest? It was different in our policy. That

is what has divided us; that is what is dividing these men here to-night; that is what leaves him on one side and us on the other.

I call no names; we will let the facts do the talking; and ask the question why do you fight the trades unions except to smash them, and what are you to gain by smashing them, when you must get the men that are now in the unions to get into Socialism before you can possibly inaugurate the Co-operative Commonwealth? You have got to get those very men. You are now fighting their organizations. If you can convince them at one time you can convince them in their union. I say the policy of the Social Democratic Party, as opposed to the policy of the S. T. & L. A., is to go into the trade unions, work with them, and mark you, do not to the strike and the boycott independent political action; and I have shown to you that it is possible to do both by arguments taken from their own discussion, and by the constitutions of trade unions that I have pointed out to you. (Applause.)

DE LEON—Mr. Harriman asked why did he take up this cigar-makers' case. He took up the case of the cigar-makers for the simple reason that he has wanted to turn this debate, which is upon a question of principle, into a concrete case, coming here with "affidavits." He has taken up that case, because he has pursued the policy of trying to falsify a principle by taking up one concrete case, and since his principle is untenable, he must hang on to that concrete case all he can. In trying to do that, even his concrete case, being false, breaks in his hands, as any man who has followed him closely must have observed. (Hisses.) He claimed that I pronounced false all that he said in connection with Davis's shop. I did not. All that was material I pronounced false or a fraud upon you. The duplicity of his argument can't have escaped you.

He said in one place when he first spoke, that the affidavit of Davis was backed up by Alliance men; after he read the names, he contradicted himself and said, "I do not know whether these are Alliance men or not," and later again he repeated the false statement that Davis's affidavit was backed by Alliance men. He contradicted himself three times.

The whole point turns on this: The Davis shop was an OPEN SHOP. (That affidavit shows nothing to the contrary.) There can be no open shop with men who are not members of a union. The Davis shop was an open shop, that open shop was called out by two representatives of the International Union, and those of you who understand this point will comprehend that the whole argument which has been built upon the false insinuation that the shop was an International Union shop will crumble. As the shop was a non-union shop, or an open shop, the International Union had no control. It tried to get control by calling the shop out, and may or may not have applied for a strike allowance, for a strike permit, a strike license—I forget now what they call it. But a strike permit, a strike license—my opponent tried to make out, from the fact that a strike permit had been applied for at the International headquarters, that therefore the Davis shop was a union shop. This is fraudulent reasoning intended to deceive you.

That one thing, that many of them went out, notwithstanding they decided not to strike, is one of the misfortunes of the situation; the moment the Organized Scabbery says the word "scab" every coward trembles in his boots. All that was read from this affidavit can only have the object to mix you up. The position is simply this: There was no union organization there. It was not controlled by the International Union, and that was the claim he made all along, the point that he dishonestly tried to insinuate in your minds, and without which he has no case, even this Davis side-issue, with which he has tried to cover his rout on the real issue, the question of principles.

He has quoted the constitution of the International Union. What of it? That's only some more dust. The union constitution says all that; but all that applies only in case the shop is a union shop, Davis's shop was not a union shop, so that all that argument falls again.

All such quotations have but one purpose, the dishonest one of twisting an argument away, and running away from the question of the evening. The dishonesty is all the more glaring by the attempts to back it up by what we are told is an affidavit. What matters it what Davis, a capitalist, swore to in order to secure an injunction? I'm not surprised my opponent falls back on such "documents." He is one of a crew, thirty-six of whom, in a vain attempt to steal the name of the Socialist Labor Party, SWORE to the truthfulness of an affidavit that was not in existence. (Hisses.) I should not have to insist upon the point, unless you are fools, which you do not look to be.

I charged him with having quoted little unions, whereupon he quotes the big "International Mechanists" in rebuttal, and says what a big union that is. You know very well that I said upon the subject that he quoted the little union of Teche as an argument, within our ranks, why our members should remain officers of pure and simple unions. On the contrary, just the reversal of what he falsely said, I said that the unions that I quoted were the large unions, I named him the International Union which he himself quoted, as one of the large organizations; but, as I say, such petty tricks and such duplicity I should not have to go into very extensively.

He said that the Central Federation—that's what he called it—split off because it could no longer endorse my tactics. Correct. Our tactics are that a labor paper must not have capitalist advertisements in it; their tactics are different. And since the "New Yorker Volkszeitung" itself has had during campaigns advertisements of capitalist politicians, consequently the tactics of the Federation agreed exactly with the tactics of those who would bore from within, and they made common cause. (Applause and hisses.)

I was asked how much I got for the "Davis job." I noticed that our chairman was shocked. (Hisses.) I will not refer to that any further than to say that when a person takes up an argument the way that my opponent did, and then fixes himself on a long affidavit that can not be debated, let alone verified, in a large crowd, a document that a person would have to take home with him to study—when a person tries that

game (hisses), I believe I should be justified to ask—not of him, such persons I cannot stoop to address—I believe I should be justified to ask: "How much did he get from the Organized Scabbery of the International Union to help deceive the workers?" (Great applause; hisses; De Leon steps forward and pointing to a corner from whence the hisses came.) His answer. I have faced worse crowds of fakirs. You cannot deceive me. It is not to this meeting alone that I am speaking. I am addressing to-night millions of workers. This debate is being taken down stenographically, and will be published in full. (Great applause.)

Some of the statements and arguments which the gentleman made are characteristic, inasmuch as they betray his absolute ignorance of the Labor Movement. Apart from his not even knowing the names of the organizations that he mentioned, he made this argument. He said: "Why, go into these unions, then you can speak to the workmen." Which means that outside of the unions there are no workmen; it can mean that or nothing. Now outside of the unions stand the overwhelming majority of the workmen; and they do not propose to go into these organizations run by the Organized Scabbery, because they have burned their fingers there enough. (Great applause.) The organization of the future has to be built up out of the men who are now unorganized, and that is the overwhelming majority of the workmen in the nation. Of course that he doesn't know. (Snickers.)

He says we want to smash the unions with a little bit of an Alliance. That is like what the heifers and the politicians have told me: "You want to smash the large Republican and Democratic parties with a little bit of a Socialist Labor Party." (Laughter and applause.)

Finally he boasts of their "political success." When he quotes the late political campaign, he puts his foot into it badly. In the Sixteenth Assembly District of New York, himself with the rest of them went there and carried on a most virulent campaign upon this very line of trade unionism against us, and the result of it was that, despite the unparalleled backing that they had of the capitalist press, their candidate for the presidency polled just about 200 votes, while ours polled over 800. (Applause); and their candidate for Assembly fell even below 200 votes, while myself, whom they have done the honor of imputing all the virtues of this movement to, and assailed proportionately, polled over 1,500 votes. That is an endorsement, emphatic, too, of the S. T. & L. A. policy. (Great applause.)

This closed the debate. It was 10:30 p. m., and the chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

[A certain amount of liberty the stenographer was compelled to take in transcribing Mr. Harriman's two speeches. As Mr. Harriman is an illiterate man, a faithful transcription of his sentences would have made them look full of typographical errors. His grammatical mistakes were, accordingly, eliminated.]

GROWTH OF SOCIALISM.

ITS INITIATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOVEMENT.

Factors Which Helped—The Intellectual Side—Obstacles Which Had to Be Overcome—Results of the Wars in Which the Nation Figured.

From 1848 to 1864 there was little sign of a Socialist movement of an international character, and although Lassalle's vigorous agitation in Germany, which began in 1862, produced a great effect in that country, no serious attempt was made to organize a general combination of Socialists until two years later. In November, 1864, a meeting was held in London which laid the foundation of the International Working Men's Association. Karl Marx was the brain of the movement, which soon spread to every civilized country and organized Cabinets of Europe. The International in effect proclaimed the "solidarity" of interest between the workers of all nations, and called upon them to unite under the banner of the means of production, including the land, in every country. Its leaders declared also that the struggle between classes in each state was a real matter of importance to the working class, which everywhere suffered from the oppression of the classes above; that therefore they should sink national differences in a great international struggle for the emancipation of the workers. These ideas obtained more ready acceptance in Germany than elsewhere, as might have been expected from the superior education of the German working classes and from the fact that the heads of the movement were Germans; but up to the date of the declaration of war between France and Germany the International did fair to become a most important body, and to combine the proletarian in a really formidable movement all over Europe.

When the war was over Paris found that though she had got rid of the Emperor, with his gang of professional rascals and prostitutes, France was to be handed over to the exploitation of a republican Republic. The Parisians, therefore, resenting this mean substitution, made an attempt to secure perfect commercial independence before admitting the troops from without. The movement was at first necessarily in middle-class hands, and the Socialists of Paris were warned by the leaders of the International that as a simultaneous rising in Berlin, Vienna, Madrid, etc., had been impossible to arrange, failure was certain. The French Socialists were informed of this prediction, and set to work to discredit its authors. But, when the Commune had once been set on foot, it soon became clear that Paris was destined to be the scene of another bloody, but again, for the time, fruitless campaign of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Yet the champions of that class alone showed unfaltering resolution and dauntless courage in the face of danger and in the face of death.

Paris was to a large extent injured by the attacks of the troops, and partly by the actions of the beaten forces of the Commune; but the horrors of the cold-blooded massacre which followed, the inhuman massacres of the Versailles troops, which such monsters as Gouffé at their head, and the fearful scenes on the plain of battle have effaced almost all memory of the errors of the vanquished. Once more "order" rose in place of the best government for the many that Paris had ever seen. Throughout the world to-day the remembrance of that fearful struggle and defeat strengthens the determination of the real leaders of the proletarian revolution.

From that date forward organized Socialism has made way against many difficulties, the apathy of Englishmen having largely contributed to check any real re-commencement of the international movement.

enlarged. With these laborers must be numbered a large portion of the lowest middle-class who practically depend upon and are a portion of the proletariat, certain of the intellectual proletariat, clerks, &c., who are learning how they are being exploited themselves by their employers, and the domestic servants, whose servile, degraded position will be felt more and more as education spreads. Here is the last class antagonism, which indeed is world-wide—the antagonism of the slaves of the machine, the mere social engines for producing surplus value and contributing to luxury, against the capitalist class and their hangers-on, the landlords. All other antagonisms, complicated as they were, have now faded into this one simple unmistakable hostility of clearly defined inimical interests between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Proletarian production—capitalist appropriation—workers make—traders take. Socialized production: individual exchange. Work in concert; exchange at war. Supremacy of town; subservience of country. Overcrowded cities; empty fields. Such are the briefest possible statements of the economical and social forms which result in our present anarchy, not for one class alone, though that suffers far the most, but for all. And the system, as a whole, is now world-wide, though in different shapes. Capital dominates the planet, acts irrespectively of all nationalities, grabs its profits irrespective of all creeds and conditions; capital is international, unsectarian, destitute of regard for humanity or religion. The proletarians must learn from the system which they have to overthrow to be equally indifferent to class, creed or color, religion or nationality, so long as the individuals sink their personal objects in a resolute endeavor against the common enemy. United for this we educate, to this end we agitate, to achieve a certain victory for all we organize. Unite! Unite! Unite!

But we are all only working in a great economic movement, which we can help in some degree to advance or retard, but which will proceed whatever we do to push on or to hinder. The very conditions of production are bringing about changes in spite of the efforts of the capitalist class itself. It has been found necessary to use the power of the State more and more to check the unbridled greed of the classes who renegade labor. Even the middle-class debating club at Westminster, which passes muster as the English House of Commons, has found itself compelled by the exigencies of the case to interpose between the employers and their wage-slaves, between the Irish landlords and their serfs, between adulterating poisoners and their victims. The domain of laissez-faire, the hideous realm of misrule, has been invaded year by year by the State, controlled though it is by the oppressing classes, because some steps were absolutely essential to save the mass of the population from utter physical, moral and intellectual deterioration. Education Acts, Irish Land Acts, Employers' Liability Acts, Factory Acts, Artisans' Dwellings Acts, these and others are direct evidence of the tendency to limit that unrestrained free contract so dear to the capitalist slave driver of modern times. They are but half-way measures, a best. What more could they be when enacted, administered and applied by the very classes which, according to the debased estimate of the aims and pleasures of life commonly held among those classes themselves, have most to lose by a thorough reorganization? But their very appearance on the Statute Book proves that the era of middle-class rule and the period of working-class apathy are alike coming to an end.

The fear of the pressure from without of a threatening kind lends the luxurious classes to try to negotiate. Bankrupt of ideas, destitute of principles, their one endeavor is to compromise on favorable terms. But for us no compromise is possible which shall carry with it the continuance of the present misery.

Yet again we see the power of the State extending. It organizes as well as orders, decries as well as restrains. This, too, in spite of huckster economy and huckster economists, whose principal professors are forced to eat their own words as administrators and to stultify their teaching as thinkers by sheer pressure of the course of events.

At this hour the State is by far the largest employer of labor in the kingdom. The Post Office, the Telegraphs, the Parcels Post, the State Banks, the Arsenal, the Dockyards, the Clothing Establishment, the Army and Navy, are all managed by the State, and administered by the State officials, who organize the labor below. The objection of the system is not inefficiency nor even extravagance, but the fact that those who labor are brought into competition with the lowest wages outside; and that the profits of their production or distribution are used by the State to reduce the taxation which has to be paid by the middle-class.

But in this direction lies the best prospect for reform and reorganization without bloodshed. The Railways, the Shipping Companies, the Great Machine Factories, are even now ready to be handled by the State through their present officials, but under the direct control of the producing class (which will comprise the whole community) and without the endeavor to exact a profit at the expense of the overwork of the employees as is at present the case. Shareholders and factory lords have no more power, as assuredly they have no more right, than landlords to keep back that organization of the labor of all, for the benefit of all, which is the only possible outlet from our present anarchical system of production for profit and never-ending round of commercial crises, due to the revolt of the socialized method of production against the individualized form of exchange.

When a glut of goods exists on one hand, and men eager for those goods and anxious to work stand idle and foodless on the other, when these two factors of well-being cannot be brought together because of the necessity to produce for profit which the very glut itself prevents, surely anarchy in production and exchange has been driven to the last ditch of absurdity. When hundreds of thousands of children are brought into the world under such conditions that good food, good health, good education are for them impossible—the essential foundations, though all three are of true morality and sound citizenship in later life—surely here too the anarchy in our commonest social relations is clearly manifested. When also we look around at the complete division between classes, their utter ignorance of what the others think and feel, the incapacity of men and women of different classes to sit comfortably at the same table, though of the same race, language and creed, here, even apart from the necessary antagonism of economic interests, the social anarchy which the middle classes call order once more stares us in the face.

After these instances of disintegration and disorder, the ugliness, waste, and indigestion seem comparatively trifling. Yet so long as competitive commerce and production for profit continue, based upon wage-slavery below, no change for the better can be wrought. As capitalism saps all healthy social relations and reduces even the closest connection between the sexes to a mere question of bargain and sale, so it threatens to destroy the springs of all art—that is, of the external beauty of life, and to reduce the world to a state of barbarism; a treat which can only be met by the demands of social order for the communizing of exchange and of the means of production, so that labor may be freed from the merely useless toil in which it is to a large extent at present employed, so that while machinery is used for performing labor repulsive to men, the intelligence of the workmen may be made available for the higher needs of the community, so that the greater and better part of productive labor may become a voluntary, reasonable and pleasurable exercise of the human faculties, instead of a compulsory, degrading and unhappy struggle for existence, human in nothing save its suffering, the tragedy of the battle against starvation.

How then would individuality, that unceasing cry of the bore and the dullard, be stunted by a system which should leave full play to the highest faculties of every man in return for trifling, pleasant social labor, nay, which should develop those faculties for all classes far more than they are developed to-day? Under such a system, where mankind collectively controlled their means of production, with machinery ever improving by the genius of their fellows, but used for instead of against the mass of

MUNICIPAL PLATFORM

Of the Socialist Labor Party of Salem, Mass.

The Socialist Labor Party of Salem, Mass., in convention assembled, endorses the principles, policy and tactics of the Socialist Labor Party of America in the political field, and of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance in the economic field.

We call the attention of the working men voters of Salem to the fact that the question of wages is the most important one to the working class.

Wages is the price of his labor-power that the workman is compelled to sell to the capitalist, and is regulated by the law of supply and demand like any other piece of merchandise. It therefore follows, that with the increasing invention of machinery and the formation of trusts, which displace workmen, both the supply of labor is increased and the demand for labor is diminished, causing wages to fall continually lower and lower.

We also call attention to the fact that labor applied to the resources of nature is the source of all wealth. Those who supply their labor to the production of wealth, the working class, are entitled to the full product of their toil, and the capitalists, who perform no useful work, are entitled to nothing.

The capitalist class is able to hold the working class in bondage by owning the means of production and distribution (the land, mills, shops, factories, railroads, etc.). Also by controlling the political power of city, state and nation.

It matters not which branch of the controlling capitalist class is in power the human race, men would at length be really free in every sense, economic, social, and political; save that they would no longer possess the freedom to enslave and embroil their fellow men. Individuality is crushed to-day in every direction. The poor slave to the machine, the overworked hind, or domestic drudge have no time for individuality, no strength left for their own education or development. Under our present system there is no individuality for the mass of mankind.

For reconstruction and reorganization, therefore, we Socialists continually strive, looking to the complete physical, moral and intellectual development of every human being as the highest form of the social state, as the best and truest happiness for every individual, and for every class, where, as none need overwork, so none shall be able to force others to work for their profit. And this is Utopian! Nay, it is utopian, perhaps, when the powers of man over nature were trifling compared with what they are to-day, and mere division of labor almost necessarily involved the formation of castes and classes. But now steam, electricity, the forces growing daily under our hand, render equality a necessity unless barbarism and bloodless destruction are to come upon us in our very midst. For as ideas grow, as education spreads, so does the knowledge of how to turn the increasing powers of devastation to account increase among the needy and the oppressed. Gunpowder helped to sweep away feudalism, with all its beauty and all its chivalry, when new forms arose from the decay of the old; now far stronger explosives are arrayed against capitalism; while the ideas of the time are as life with revolution as they were when feudalism fell. To avoid alike the crushing anarchy of to-day and the fierce anarchy of to-morrow, we strive to help forward the workers to the control of the State, as the only means whereby such hideous trouble can be avoided, and production and exchange can be organized for the benefit of the country at large. Thus, therefore, we propose that all should have the vote; not that the vote will free them from economic oppression, but because in this way alone is a peaceful issue possible for the possessing classes. It is better for them to yield to the vote of organized numbers than to the victory of even organized force.

—the Republican branch, the Democratic branch or the Independent candidates—all are capitalistic and all use the courts, the police and the military for the purpose of keeping the workers in subjection. They also control the educational institutions and teach false economics, false patriotism, false morals to the young to justify their position.

We know that the working class cannot gain its full emancipation by carrying the election in a town or a city; in fact, not until we carry the whole country, but meanwhile much can be done to relieve the misery and suffering of the workers by controlling the municipal government.

Our candidates if elected, pledge themselves to push the following:

MUNICIPAL DEMANDS.

1. In all cases of strikes or lockouts the municipal government shall assist the victims in every possible way—financially and with police protection.
2. Employment for the unemployed for public improvements, eight hours to constitute a day's work.
3. That every municipal officer shall be subject to withdrawal from office upon demand of any party for neglect of duty. The adoption of the general vote on all important laws and questions of social interest.
4. The public ownership of street railways and lighting-plants. The Socialist Labor Party demands that the employees in these municipal enterprises elect their foremen, superintendents and other officers not elected by general vote of the people at a minimum wage for an eight hour day and a division of the surplus among the employees after deduction for pension fund for aged employees, relief fund for the sick and improvement of the service; no employees to be discharged for political reasons.
5. The establishment of municipal coal and wood yards, drug stores, milk depots, bake-shop and other municipal agencies for the supply of necessities at cost price.
6. Compulsory education of all children under sixteen years of age—the municipal government to supply meals, clothing and even lodging of children when want and necessity require it.
7. The establishment of free bath houses, gymnasiums and play grounds.
8. Socialist officials will do all in their power to compel the assessors to do their full duty by assessing every kind of property its full value, so that all forms of wealth as well as real estate chiefly owned by bankers, stockholders, merchants, railway and trust magnates and other capitalists will not escape taxation through perjury and official connivance.

The Socialist Labor Party ticket for Salem is:

For Mayor—Thomas F. Brennan.
For Aldermen—John F. Box, Michael H. Powers, Thomas H. Condon, Michael J. Quirk.

Workingmen—You do worse than throw your vote away by voting for any candidates but of the Socialist Labor Party. Vote your protest against wage slavery by voting the Socialist Labor Party ticket.

IMPORTANT WARNING.

In presenting the above demands we emphasize the fact they are palliatives, and that the condition of the working class cannot be permanently improved until the final overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of the Socialist Republic.

Workingmen—Vote your ticket—the Socialist Labor Party—and vote straight!

The larger cities of the country are much worked up over the habit women have fallen into of indulging in strong drink. It so happens that the women move in the "best circles," and consequently the crime is all the more horrible. The reports do not say whether or not they move in those circles when intoxicated, but it is probable to suppose that they do. This arouses an interesting discussion. What is a good circle for a debutant to move in? Should that circle be of large or small circumference? Should they ever again move in good circles? If, by accident, they should describe a perimetric that was not true, would that be an inferior circle? The state of society is bad when intoxicated society women take to moving in the "best circles," and some remedy should be found at once.

SOCIALISTS CONQUER OFFICE.

They Do Not Make Bargains With Capitalist Interests.

We clip the following from the Los Angeles "Record":

"The Socialist Labor nominees have made answer to the committee of safety on the subject of the appointment of a police commission, should the nominees be successful at the approaching city election. The answer, like a foghorn on a dark and storm-swept coast, speaks for itself."

Los Angeles, Nov. 21, 1900.
J. S. Slauson, Chairman Committee of Safety:

Dear Sir: We the nominees of the Socialist Labor Party for councilmen of this city, take this opportunity to acknowledge receipt of your communication, asking us to pledge ourselves to vote for a board of police commissioners to be selected by said committee of safety, in order that the board may be taken out of politics and capable businessmen be appointed to fill the positions.

Now, sir, we beg to state that the candidates of the Socialist Labor Party never make bargains or compromise with capitalist interests. We are a party of workingmen, whose mission it is to fight the battles of labor. We believe in every one holding office from president to dogcatcher being elected by the people, and under no circumstances would we agree to the bestowal to any set or individuals of more power than they at present possess.

Such power, we know full well, would be used for the benefit of the capitalist class and to the detriment of the working class. The abuse of power is bad enough now and, with the memory fresh in our minds of Pullman, Wardner, the Bull Pen, etc., where the workers have been shot and clubbed into submission, we prefer to let things remain as they are, until the working class come to a full realization of their power and their duty to each other, and vote themselves into possession of the government.

Our ultimate mission is the establishment of the Socialist republic, when we capture the national power and, if elected to municipal office to fight the battles of labor as far as our power will allow us.

Our slogan is: "The working class; may they always be right, but first, last, and all the time the working class."

To emphasize the solidarity of our aspirations, we prefer to sign ourselves collectively and individually.

Candidates of the Socialist Labor Party for the city council of Los Angeles:

S. I. Cooper, nominee First Ward.
W. T. Skinner, nominee Second Ward.
Geo. Anderson, nominee Fourth Ward.
W. H. Smith, nominee Fifth Ward.
J. O. Becker, nominee Sixth Ward.
D. W. Kernashan, nominee Seventh Ward.
Adolph Weinberg, nominee Eighth Ward.
Sylvan Todd, nominee Ninth Ward.

The Social Democrats of Boston made nominations for several offices, and they seem almost like desecrations of the dead. Several of the nominees were members of the Socialist Labor Party years and years ago. They fell by the wayside, unable to keep pace with the development of the movement and now they have been resurrected to stand the heat and fire of a political campaign. It is not only desecration it is a crime. When you read the list of names it is like going through an obituary report of olden times. The last one died in 1894 and was buried some time before he died. In his reincarnation he followed Bryan; then he chased frantically after the shade of the Populist movement; then he once more became a "Socialist"—and voted for Bryan. The classic wit of Boston is well shown by parading such persons for public edification.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS.

CLEVER PLAN TO REMOVE POSSIBLE OBJECTION TO TRADING.

They Are In Favor of the Abolition of a Central Directing Power—Prefer Weak and Vacillating State Committees—Crooks Evidently Now In Complete Control.

The Social Democrats are worked up over the prospect of abolishing all control over the individual branches and members. Hitherto some friction has been engendered by the shadow of a committee that existed, and those who are in business for the sake of political deals and plunder wish all restraints removed. The leaders are the Iowa and Texas men, who see opportunities in those states for some fine trading. They are ably assisted by E. G. E. Gordon, of Manchester, in order that there may be a definite knowledge on the part of the Socialists as to what is being done by these political decoy ducks we print in full Gordon's letter on the subject.

I am glad to note that you stand for a change of the name of our Socialist movement. I was the first to suggest a change in the name. Later on I stood for the name in order to effect a union of Socialists, but found out that in place of union we have disunion.

I know full well the argument that is made against a change of the name; that "Christianism" may mean "State Socialism," "Christian Socialism" or "Democratic Socialism," etc. They also tell us that Social Democratic means Democratic Socialism.

Now it would seem that S. D. P. in this country means two different Socialist factions, one centered at Chicago and the other at Springfield. In the first place the real reason for Socialist disunion is our form of organization. To compel men to pay dues in order to take part in a grand, noble and moral, as well as a true economic movement, is the height of ridiculousness.

National executive boards means dues, charters, constitutions, and lots of other old tape. National executive boards are anti-Socialist—first, because in order to be effective at all they must have power, and the placing of power in the hands of a few is anti-socialistic and undemocratic. And secondly, national executive boards are not needed. They cost from \$6,000 to \$8,000 a year and the work they do is largely a duplication of the work which is much better done by the state committees.

National executive boards have been the cause of Socialist splits in this nation for 16 years, they have always been dangerous, and no doubt always will be, to the peace and success of the Socialist movement.

The trouble is, that our national executive boards make partisans of us, produce a spirit of intolerance and narrow-mindedness, bring on hate and discord, and are a stumbling-block, in the way of progress. When men think more of a partisan organization than they do of a united Socialist movement they are simply partisans first and Socialists afterwards. Nearly every Socialist party of Europe gets on quite well without constitutions, national executive boards and such red tape. Why can't we?

We can unite in a solid political union by states. The danger is that 3,000 or 4,000 Socialists will continue to pay dues to both Chicago and Springfield, and the result in 1904 will be that we will have a first-class row. It is far more important to have peace in 1904 than in 1900. The only way we can get peace in the future is to abolish that which makes war—national executive boards. Socialists can always unite on a platform and candidates, but when it comes to constitutions, official organs, national executive boards, etc., we fight. The thing to do, then, is for the Socialists in each state to get together in their respective states and use their dues for a propaganda for Socialism, and not waste them on good-for-nothing national boards. The 500,000 middle-of-the-road "opponents of the South" will never consent to join a party that has the name of "democratic" attached to it—F. G. H. Gordon in Nebraska Socialist.

WEEKLY PEOPLE.

Published by the Socialist Labor Party,
at 24 and 6 New Reade St.,
New York.

P.O. Box 1576, Telephone 129 Franklin.
EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Invariably in advance

Single Copy..... 25
Six months..... \$2
One year..... \$3.50

Bundle rates: Less than 100 copies, 1 cent a copy; 100 to 500 copies, 1/2 cent a copy; 500 or more, 1/4 cent a copy.
As far as possible, rejected communications will be returned if so desired and stamps are enclosed.

Entered as second class matter at the New York Post Office, June 27, 1900.

SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1888 (Presidential)..... 2,068
In 1890..... 13,331
In 1892 (Presidential)..... 21,157
In 1894..... 83,133
In 1896 (Presidential)..... 36,564
In 1898..... 82,204
In 1899..... 85,231



We have belied a few industrial lepers, and we shall bell more before the year is out. The party has in reality cut its wisdom teeth, and the wisdom teeth have cut a few fingers that were where they should not be.

FRANK MACDONALD.

This issue contains a verbatim stenographic report of the debate on Trade Unionism that took place last Sunday in New Haven, Ct., between a representative of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, or New Trade Unionism, and a representative of Pure and Simple, or O.D. Style Trade Unionism.

No serious man, engaged in the Labor Movement, can afford to leave this report unread and unstudied.

The presentation, though narrowed into a two hours' debate, is complete. It places clearly the mainly necessary attitude of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, together with the history of Unionism back of it, and it portrays to perfection both the imbecility of its adversaries and the fraudulency of their posture.

The debate furnishes the completest photograph yet produced of the Trades Union Issue. By bringing both sides in juxtaposition, each supplements the other, and both are best understood.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Never yet has the annual performance, known as the "President's Message," reached the depth or the height of hypocrisy that did McKinley's message, read the other day before Congress. One is accustomed to hear rehearsed in these performances the trite phrases about the country's grandeur, the liberty of our people, the happiness of our working class, the industry of our idle or Capitalist Class; to all this one has grown accustomed, attaching no more importance to it than to the commonplace of civility that are uttered even among people on unfriendly terms. But yesterday's performance outdoes all that has hitherto been done of late upon this line.

The President's message rightly gives the right of way to operations in China and the Philippine Islands. And yet, after opening with two such points, that mark a complete subversion of the country's policy, the message brazenly closes with this passage:

"Our growing power brings with it temptations and perils requiring constant vigilance to avoid. It must not be used to invite conflicts nor for oppression, but for the more effective maintenance of those principles of equality and justice upon which our institutions and happiness depend. Let us keep always in mind that the foundation of our government is liberty; its superstructure peace."

The serving of the devil in God's livery has many exemplifications; never yet, however, was the vile performance exhibited in such unblushing style, upon such an elevated stage, or by so exalted an actor.

To the tune of pretending to warn against the "abuse of power," the national invasion of two distant and weak peoples is commended; to the tune of avoiding deeds of oppression, military operations are favored, intended only to subjugate unwilling nations; to the tune of peace, the war-drum is beaten; to the tune of liberty the chains of vassalage are forged! Non is this all. To the tune of "justice," our products are to be rammed down the throats of unwilling purchasers; to the tune of "our happiness," broad fields are to be opened, whence the already overstocked Labor

Market at home will be swollen by millions of additional competitors; to the tune of "equality," the foundation is laid to intensify the economic inequality that already plagues us at home!

The "President's Message" having reached this notch, what dizzy height of perfidy can be henceforth expected from that quarter?

THEY SCENT EACH OTHER.

Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, president of the Citizens' Union, issued last Wednesday a political proclamation. In it occurs this passage:

"France has recently given us a splendid object-lesson of unselfish public spirit exhibited in an extraordinary coalition. When the nation was trembling on the brink of the abyss of military despotism, a republican lawyer, a Royalist general and a leading Socialist united to save the state, and their splendid initiative created a patriotic revival strong enough to accomplish the purpose. When we are ready to follow their example and to add a positive programme to united front, the redemption of the city will be easy. If we would win response, we must discard the trifling expedient of endeavoring to arouse public sentiment by appealing to the tax rate, and have our call to arms upon broad progressive grounds. What the people demand is not retrenchment, but growth; not reform, but progress. Discarding our negative issues, the anti-imperial, anti-silver, anti-trust, yes, even anti-boss, we must adopt a great positive programme, 'pro bono publico.'"

Who will henceforth deny the existence of a strong elective affinity in social and political movements, as well as among chemical substances?

Millerand, claiming to be a Socialist, accepts a job at the hands of Premier Waldeck-Rousseau, a capitalist; and forthwith proceeds to earn his spurs as just the kind of Socialist fit too, for the distinction of a seat in a capitalist cabinet, by taking his share of responsibility for, thereby approving, the conduct of the cabinet in shooting down workingmen on strike. Mr. Robert Fulton Cutting, a gentleman, whose tenement houses on Cherry street were in such condition that even the Board of Health could not stand them, and had to order them torn down as a menace and nuisance—these two worthies scent each other across the ocean, and conspire.

"Pro bono publico" means different things in different months. By its fruit a tree is known. So, likewise, is the "publico," that is meant each time, ascertained by those from whose mouths it drops. With a Millerand, the "public" whose welfare is sought, can surely not be the workingmen, who, seeking higher wages, are shot down at the command or with the consent of the cabinet. With a Robert Fulton Cutting, the public whose welfare is to be sought can assuredly not be the workers for whom squalid tenements are provided and from whom the rent is extorted for such unsanitary quarters. The "public" with both gentlemen can only mean and be the idle class of capitalism, the brigand class that fleeces the workers.

And that is all it means. We are living in the days of capitalism, and there are just two nations in which capitalism may be properly studied. They are America and France. Other countries may have reached a high capitalist development in industry, but their forms of government still savor of the feudal and thus preserve some principles of self-respect. In America and France alone, the breath of capitalism has invaded the government as well as the shop. Accordingly, in these two nations alone is the phenomenon of the chicanery, practiced by the capitalist in the shop, visible in his political dealings also. The counterpart of the adulteration of goods, practiced by the capitalist in production, is the adulteration of political issues, practiced by the capitalist in government. Thus it happens that capitalism in France and America adulterates its political issues. Instead of bluntly stating what it stands for it conceals itself behind expressions that are in public favor. Thus it happens that an idler and raw-boned fleecer of the workers in America, like Robert Fulton Cutting, falls in line with the modern French capitalist governmental trick, "Socialism" becomes a dear word with him, and "pro bono publico" a first rate ingredient to foist his shoddy political product upon the public.

These are the days that crave wary political walking. Never was it more important than now to look behind phrases and ascertain facts. As a Cutting in America scents across the waters a Millerand in France, recognizes his kin, and adopts his methods, so, likewise, must the working class of America recognize its kin in the well-drilled, class-conscious hosts of the French Socialist Labor Party (Parti Ouvrier Français), and stand alert as stands this French organization.

PRINCIPLE VS. FLY-PAPER.

Eugene V. Debs did not draw as well as we expected. Sure it is, however, that he drew more votes than any other candidate whom our party could have set up—Milwaukee, Wis., "Warheit" (Social Democrat).

Correct! The admission herein contained, tho' tardy, loses none of its weight.

Which is why, we say, and our lan-

guage is plain, that, whatever the poll of the Social Democracy, that vote was not given to a principle, least of all to Socialism; and, what is more, that, in setting up Mr. Debs, his "party" looked not to principle; it looked to votes; and, in order to catch these, it was guided in its choice of candidate by his fly-paper qualities exclusively.

No one, approximately posted on current events, is for a moment deceived upon the Social Democracy. Its organization is known to be made up of the flotsam and jetsam of "reform" and kindred movements that have periodically sprung up in the land for the last twenty years or more, together with a goodly sprinkling of vicious schemers who found the Socialist Labor Party too "narrow" and too "intolerant" to be practiced upon, and were fired out. The organization of this concern—split up from its inception under two hostile headquarters—clearly patented the material it was made of. The circumstance that, despite this glaring evidence of absence of principle and of freking ambition, it claimed to be the "United Socialists," added light to this leading feature of the concern.

The individuals who compose such a body have but one common point of contact. That is, the Scheme; the more or less unhallowed Scheme. To encompass their Schemes they must have a big vote. Accordingly they "pool" their issues," and, as a result of all this, the standard bearers they set up must partake of fly-paper qualities.

Mr. Debs was expected to fill the bill admirably. He was "lovely,"—the sentimentalists were expected to vote for him. He was a "martyr,"—the glibbly were expected to vote for him. He was expected to be recitatively poetic,—the dreamers were expected to plump their votes for him. He was "all things to all men,"—the unwary were expected to be corralled wholesale at the hustings. Socialism was the last thing considered. With all these fly-paper qualities, Mr. Debs distanced all competitors in the race, and got the nomination. He was expected to "run" like a racer. "At least one million votes!" exclaimed his train carriers, now his pall-bearers, and they meant "at least two millions!" Indeed, they needed them. Small votes no longer suffice for schemers. No wonder the actual vote—considerably below 100,000—has chilled the schemers' ardor (read expectations).

With the wrangle now going on among the schemers, as betrayed by the quotation that heads this article, we have no concern. Let one set claim they had a better fly-paper candidate, and another set give the fly-paper palm to Debs. What interests the country is the proof, gleaned at this election, that fly-paper candidates have lost their drawing power. The country is growing wise. The flies are growing appallingly few.

To PRINCIPLE, not FLY-PAPER, is the future reserved. Like Truth, PRINCIPLE may gain ground slowly, but it gains ground, and ultimately yields sway; FLY-PAPER, on the contrary, wears out speedily, and is cast into the ash barrel of Time.

"WE THE PEOPLE" DWINDLINGLY "UNITING."

Recent reports from Chicago are tart reading. They tell of "all day mass meetings" held by all the Socialist forces for the purpose of "uniting," and leading the "united people" in a triumphant municipal campaign to be opened right away, if not sooner. These events awaken timely reminiscences. In being awakened, the reminiscences incidentally cast valuable, betrayful light upon the Social Democratic vote in Chicago last November 6.

It was late in the summer of '94. The "people" ("leading Socialists" were said to be prominent among them), had just behind them the presidential campaign of '92. In that year the leader of the "people" (the "leading Socialists" included), had polled 22,207 votes in Illinois, of which 1,614 had been contributed by Cook County (Chicago). This was not much of a popular showing for the "people," but it was something.

When the latter part of the summer of '94 have in sight, the "people," the "united people," among them, of course, the inevitable "Socialist luminaries and forces," foregathered again. They were to make a second effort. The occasion was considered most favorable. The American Railway Union, with Mr. Debs as the leader and martyr, had just had its great strike, which the Federal troops and the courts had smashed. Chicago had been the theater of the affair. If sentiment could weld the "people," "all classes," the "Socialist leaders and forces" together—that was the time. One Remondolph was set up for State Treasurer,—and off the "united unitednesses" started. Particularly active was the campaign in Chicago. On one occasion, one of the inevitable "Socialist leaders," and a "force" in himself,—a gentleman whose anatomy, drooping eye-lid and inflated paunch, forcibly recalls the frog in the fable that exploded in the attempt to blow himself into the size of an ox—put a trumpet to his mouth,

and addressed a large meeting with the words, "We are the people." Election day came and the Weaver vote was nearly tripled in the State. Randolph polled 59,738 votes towards which Cook county alone contributed 33,908. There was disappointment. A much larger vote was expected. The "united people" did not seem to flock excessively. But there was consolation in the thought that Socialist Labor Party had never reached that notch.

The third stage in the development was a painful experience—to the visionaries. It was two years later. The "united people" were wiped out. Bryan absorbed them taking Debs along with him. Above the wreck there remained only the Socialist Labor Party, with a small vote of 1,147, it is true, yet firm and unperturbed.

The fourth stage was reached last campaign. The "harmonizers" again pulled together. All sorts of excuses were given for the melting away of the "unitednesses" four years ago, and a number of reasons were given why: this trip, the showing of the "united people" would be tremendous; in the first place, Debs himself was running; that meant a start, in Chicago alone, with the 33,908 votes of '94. In the second place, the "Socialists were united," the S. L. P. being said to have fused with the Social Democracy. (This was said without a blush.) In the third place, the Republican papers were booming Debs for all they were worth, puffing up his prospective vote. Upon all these grounds, the "united forces" felt confident. Election day made them all feel and look as if they had chills and fever. The Debs vote in all Illinois was only 9,672,—more than 21,000 less than the "united people's" vote of '94 in Cook county and over 50,000 votes less than in the whole State!

The performance now reported as taking place in Chicago to "unite" once more, and once more gather the "whole people," may be understood by the light of the above antecedents. Nor do the performers fail to contribute their gleams to appreciate such performances.

There is no unity of forces possible—at least not for serious and honorable results—with phrases as a basis. The nucleus for any unity worth the name, in Chicago as elsewhere, is the soundly poised, intrepid and unfettered Socialist Labor Party. Whoever, whatever fits there is unstable,—and will eventually be united; whatever does not fit there is UN-unstable, and all glue phrases to the contrary, notwithstanding, will never gather but to scatter. Rainbowchasing can never start from solid ground; neither can rainbowchasers ever hold together.

DEATH-BED CONSULTATIONS.

It has passed into a proverb that special sessions of Congress denote a weak administration. When an administration is strong, when it feels itself safe in the saddle, it can afford to wait for the regular time when Congress reconvenes. When, on the contrary, the administration feels the ground under it shaky, and does not rely upon its own nerve, then it needs Congress to lean upon, to throw at least part of the responsibility on, and to put things into shape. Such an administration hastens to convene Congress in special session. In a country where, like this, government is by party, the conduct of parties reflects the motives that guide government itself. What is going on now among the "minor parties" is, accordingly, of no minor importance. One may judge their sense of safety, their sense of conscious ascendancy by their own conduct.

Among the minor parties the Prohibition party may be ignored from the start. It is in no way a child of our American social or political life. It is a political abortion, a cross between Bible misquotations and capitalist hypocrisy. There remain the Socialist Labor Party, the Social Democracy, with headquarters in Chicago, the Social Democracy, with headquarters in Springfield, Mass., the Populist Party, the Silver Republicans, and the Middle-of-the-Roaders. How are these conducting themselves? With a single exception, they are all calling for special conventions.—Both wings of the Social Democracy, the Populists, the Silver Republicans, the Middle-of-the-Roaders, each of them, while boasting of "great success," gives the evidence of great shakiness in its anxiety for a national convention, to be held as soon as possible, if not sooner.

The exception to this tell-tale behavior on the part of the minor parties is the Socialist Labor Party. It alone is not bothering about special national conventions. Like administrations that feel perfectly safe and strong, and that, consequently, care not to convene Congress in special session, but abide the regular time, the Socialist Labor Party serenely pursues its course; it does not indulge in hysterics; its conventions are left to occur in the regular order; and, in the meantime, it carries on its work, uninterrupted.

'Tis not the votes cast or polled; 'tis

not the claims made; 'tis not the oratory and declamations indulged in that serve as a test of a political body's confidence in itself. The test is the principles on which it stands, the tactics that it pursues, the character of its organization. And among the manifestations of this test is the body's conduct after the battle. The nervous craving for conventions, manifested by all these minor parties, except the Socialist Labor Party, immediately after election betrays the fact that one and all lack confidence in themselves. And well they may. Neither their principles nor their tactics nor yet the character of their organization is of a nature to inspire them with confidence. Feeling the ground shaky under them each wants company. Hence that noverlest of sights, several of them wanting to hold conventions in common!

While the "United (?) Socialists (?) and kindred reformers, who are looking for short-cuts across lots, are losing themselves in the woods and seek to keep themselves in countenance by wild halloos, the Socialist Labor Party looks down at the set and wonders how long it will be before these would-be teachers of the people will themselves learn the A B C's of the Social Question.

EXPLOITING BLUNDERS.

The following squib occurs in the New York "Evening Post":

"By actual experience the Ruskinites, a colony of Socialists, which was transported some time ago from Tennessee to a site near Waycross, Ga., have demonstrated what is probably the lowest possible daily cost for food. They live at an actual cost per capita of less than ten cents a day."

Time and again levelly people have risen and lectured the Socialist Labor Party on its severity and intolerance. These lectures were especially reproachful on the subject of the Party's attitude towards the so-called co-operative colonies, the Ruskin colony among the rest. The above squib, published in a capitalist paper—a "rifle-dict" to the workers' paper—should serve as an ample justification to the Party's attitude.

Colonies are actual denials of Socialism; Socialism is banked upon integral co-operation.—Colonies build upon a basis so narrow that their co-operation is a caricature of the term; Socialism builds upon collective work and individual living.—Colonies build upon collective living; Socialism builds upon full enjoyment of material and intellectual wealth, an enjoyment abreast of the racial needs of the Nineteenth Century.—Colonies, as the above passage succinctly imputes to Socialism, build upon stunted enjoyment of material and intellectual wealth, an enjoyment far behind that of the present racial needs, and resembling that of the days of the infancy of the race.

The first two points have been frequently taken up in these columns. The third may as well be dealt with now.

It is a feature of sentimental Socialism to make the "cheap John" argument. Every one who approaches Socialism, not from the class struggle side, but from the sentimental side; not from the practical side of production, but from the bourgeois side of consumption;—every such person inevitably slides back and down into a position where, instead of aiding, he hampers Socialist thought; instead of weakening, he strengthens the arm of the spokesmen of Capitalism.

At this season, when the conquest of distant lands with cheap labor is being accompanied at home with articles of how cheaply man can live; at this season, the coolie condition to which the Ruskin colony reduces its colonists can only serve to strengthen the Atkinson School of Starvation. The capitalist cares not how he contradicts himself. On one side, he argues that the workingmen are too luxurious; and then he proceeds to prove with Atkinsonian cooking stoves and "Journal" game-reporters on how little man can "live, love and enjoy life." On the other hand, he will use illustrations of bogus Socialism, such as the Ruskinites furnish, in order to discredit Socialism by giving it a coolie appearance.

The Socialist Labor Party is severe and intolerant,—as severe and intolerant as science. It stands, consequently, for the only methods that can bring that about, to-wit, the uncompromising warfare upon the capitalist class conducted upon the clean-cut interests of the working class.

Such a warfare excludes all "sugar-coatings"; it excludes all trimming;—and along with that excludes the intellectually "knock-kneed" to whom the erect posture of manhood is as impossible as it is incomprehensible.



Uncle Sam and Brother Jonathan

BROTHER JONATHAN.—Do you know anything about the Socialists and Socialism?

UNCLE SAM.—Some.

B. J.—Well, I think they ought to be strung up by the heels. Don't you?

U. S.—Jumping back, startled!—Why? How you talk!

B. J.—Puckering up his brows and looking very tragic!—Why? I'll tell ye why. Because their program would tear up society by the roots; it would bust up the family; it would deprive man of all incentive to provide for and raise his children—

U. S.—Why, that WOULD be very dreadful. But how do you make all that out?

B. J.—I'll explain it to you. I got it straight from a College Professor—

U. S.—bursts out laughing.

B. J.—You will laugh the wrong side of your mouth if you listen to me. That College Professor explained that under Socialism, if you and I owned a railroad, for instance,—

U. S.—The devil take you instance! Do you and I own any railroads?

B. J.—No; but listen. If we did; supposing we did, that railroad would become common property. The new owners would have to pay their fare as well as others; they could not live on its income; and—

U. S.—Well, what at that?

B. J.—(Impatiently)—Just wait, can't you? The worst is yet to come.

U. S.—May the heavens have mercy!

B. J.—Yes; there is worse coming. If the capital that a father gathers is not sure to go to his children, but is sure to be taken away from them, what incentive would there be to work? Such a plan is heinous! It is dastardly! It is criminal! (Almost suffocating.) It is—it is—it is utterly un-American!!! (Mops the sweat off his brow.)

U. S.—(looks him over meditatively)—Guess I understand you.

B. J.—You do?

U. S.—Yes. Your point is that Socialism would interfere with inheritance.

B. J.—That's it!

U. S.—That what a father has gathered to himself belongs to his children, after he is dead.

B. J.—That's what I mean.

U. S.—And to his children's children?

B. J.—Down to the last generation.

U. S.—And that the taking of any such thing away from such children is so heinous, dastardly and criminal as to be utterly un-American.

B. J.—Absolutely un-American and not to be tolerated!

U. S.—Was Washington an American?

B. J.—A grand specimen of one!

U. S.—And Franklin?

B. J.—Oh, he was American with a vengeance!

U. S.—And Jefferson?

B. J.—There was a pink of Americanism!

U. S.—What they did, was that good or bad? American or un-American?

B. J.—Their conduct was animated by the truest American sentiments of right and justice.

U. S.—So say I. Well, these three and all our Revolutionary Fathers, that very thing that you are condemning as "heinous," "dastardly," "criminal," in short, "un-American."

B. J.—(Flaring up.)—Not much, they didn't!

U. S.—Didn't King George own these colonies?

B. J.—What of it? Yes.

U. S.—Hah! He inherited them from his ancestors, and hadn't these grabbed this territory and virtually pocketed and run it to suit themselves.

B. J.—Yes.

U. S.—Well, if it is "heinous," "dastardly," "criminal," and "un-American" to prevent that which a father owns from passing to his children so that they can enjoy it, then it certainly was heinous as heinous could be, dastardly and criminal as dastardly and criminal could be, in short, as utterly un-American as un-American could be, to deprive King George of what had been handed down to him by his ancestors, and keeping his offspring from it. Now, then, my fatty, on which horn of the dilemma will you impale yourself? Were our Revolutionary Fathers un-American, or is Socialism American up to the handle? Which?

B. J.—throws up his arms with an impatient and deprecating gesture)—That's just like you. Always giving a twist to the discussion so as to make a fellow look ridiculous to himself—

U. S.—Glad you feel that way.

B. J.—But for all that, your comparison does not hold. The two cases are not alike. King George tried to misuse his inheritance. He tried to tyrannize us by virtue of the ownership of that which his father had left to him. Under such circumstances, one has a right, one has a duty, to yank that inheritance out of his hands.

U. S.—You now amend your original proposition. Originally it was a sweeping condemnation as un-American of the act of depriving people of what their

fathers held; now the proposition is that such an act is un-American when the property is not wrongfully used, but that if the property is wrongfully used, it is the height of Americanism in those who suffer thereby to yank it from the rascal.

B. J.—I'll accept it that way.

U. S.—And I shall now show you the capital which capitalist fathers have used by them to tyrannize our people worse than King George did.

B. J.—It is?

U. S.—Have you any capital?

B. J.—Nixy.

U. S.—But you have a stomach and your wife and your children too; these must be filled.

B. J.—(Sadly shaking his head)—My wages don't enable me to do it.

U. S.—And yet you have arms and skill. Why don't you go ahead and produce shoes for yourself instead of for your employers?

B. J.—Because I have no capital I can't work without the machinery needed to make shoes.

U. S.—And do you keep all the shoe that you produce or their value?

B. J.—You disgust me! Why, no! I don't keep the value of one shoe out of every four that I turn out.

U. S.—Are you robbed out of three-fourths of your produce?

B. J.—That's about the size of it.

U. S.—And do you like to be robbed, do you feel constrained to submit to robbery, and be kept dependent upon your employer by virtue of his very ownership of what he either got from his father, or gathered himself, and would like to transmit to his children?

B. J.—makes a motion with his right leg as tho' he were kicking at something.

U. S.—That College Professor whom you heard libeling Socialism as so to deceive the people may one of these days be himself the one to be strung up, the same as the traitor Tories, who tried to spy on the Revolutionary Army.

U. S.—were strung up by Washington. Then, the property that King George owned had to be yanked out of his clutches or our people would have become his slaves; so to-day, the capital held by the Capitalist Class must be yanked out of theirs or we will be the overwhelming majority, will become coolie slaves. Socialism is the most legitimate child of Americanism.

B. J.—gives another kick in the air.

U. S.—What is that you are kicking at?

B. J.—At that traitor Tory College Professor.

The Flag of Revolt.

[Written for the DAILY PEOPLE by Mary McNabb Johnson.]

Crimson and purple in palace halls,
Merriment ringing from court and throne.

But tatters hung from the hovel wall,
Where echoed the sound of a wailing babe's moan.

It was far away and long years ago,
The burdened poor had been yoked brave;

Nobly they struggled 'mid war and woe,
Their help came only in poverty's grave.

But the maddening glory of battle and king,
Where children must suffer and weary hearts bleed,

Naught but a curse to the land and bring—
The terrible fruit of a poison seed.

And at last stern Justice, twin sister of Love,
Rang out in her thunders the tyrant's knell;

Flashed the lightning of Truth from the black sky above,
Tho' it seemed but the smoke and the flaming of hell.

The proud flaunting crimson from palace walls
Was "on" and trampled 'neath right feet;

The purple was changed into funeral pall,
A crimson life-stream stained the city street.

Oh, heaper of gold! let me ask you to pray,
As you spurn the wage-slave from your castle and tower,</

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents who prefer to appear in print under an assumed name, will attach such name to their communication, besides their own signature and address. None other will be recognized.

"Oligomarginate Socialists."

TO THE DAILY PEOPLE.—The above title has been given to the Debates here in Lynn. The local branch of the Social Democratic party has split up into three different factions. To begin with: They declared a boycott on the Social Democratic Herald of Chicago, and you cannot obtain a copy of that paper in Lynn for love or money. The English "Volkszeitung" of New York acts as their official organ. One of the local factions is headed by a Dr. Keon, and calls itself the "United Socialists" (God save the mark). A lobbyist by the name of Hitchcock heads the Carey faction, the armory builders. He is a middle class man and runs a restaurant, or "free" lunch counter. He has charge of a column in the "News." That paper is their local official organ and they boom and advertise it for all they are worth. It gives whole columns to their meetings and publishes the pictures of their candidates for office. This paper, which is one of God's smallest, cheapest, and dirtiest creatures never lets a chance pass without misrepresenting the only bona fide class-conscious workingmen's paper in the United States, the Socialist Labor Party. The "News" was originally a Republican paper but it was purchased a few weeks ago by a Democratic druggist. An editorial appeared in the "Boston Record" a few days ago and the "News" undertook to answer it. I give you below the articles:

"When the Cleveland, Whitneys, Hewitts, et al., reorganize the Democratic party and take up the reins of leadership, there'll be a tremendous 'landslide' from that party to the party of Debs. Paste this in your political hat.—Boston Record (Republican)."

This is the most truthful statement that the Record ever made. With the above mentioned men at the head, the Democratic party will be the Republican party junior. The real and only hope for the Democrats is in the Social Democratic party.—Lynn News (Democratic).

Fellow workingmen paste this in your political hat, you must organize into a class-conscious body, go to the polls on election day and vote for your class interest, for your families, and for yourselves. Throw overboard the Democratic party, and their decoy ducks, like the Social Democratic party. "He who would be free, himself, must strike the blow." God speed the day.

FRANCIS AMBROSE WALSH.
Lynn, Mass., Nov. 19th.

Playing His Friends.

Editor DAILY PEOPLE.—The following will illustrate the brotherly feeling, love of justice, etc., that to-day exist among the middle class. Mr. A runs a large grocery store in a fashionable district. He cannot make things go his way so he decides to make an assignment to his wife. Mr. and Mrs. A visit Mr. B who is one of his creditors, spend a pleasant evening playing cards and having a good time in general. Next day Mr. A makes an assignment leaving his dear friend out in the cold to the extent of a few hundred dollars. Illustrating the old business adage:

"It matters not who sinks so long as you swim." R. S.
New York, November 19.

"Hurrah for the Scandinavian."

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—The following story is now being told in the whole Scandinavian press of this country.

"In Theodore Roosevelt's company during his tour through the Western States were, for a short time, the senators Knute Nelson, of Minnesota, and Thomas H. Carter, of Montana. It is but natural that the state of affairs in general and the approaching presidential election in particular should be the principal question to concern a company like that; but on such a long and tiresome journey one also tried to entertain oneself with innocent jokes and funny tricks. Thus Senator Carter composed a campaign song that roused great hilarity. Here it is:

"Oh, the Irish and the Dutch,
They don't amount to much,
But hurrah for the Scandinavian."

"It was called 'Senator Nelson's song' and was sung in Idaho, Montana, Utah, Colorado and Kansas. Smilingly Governor Roosevelt is reported to have declared that the campaign song of Mr. Carter ought not to be considered altogether a joke, for, regarding the Republican party it is particularly well suited to the situation."

A very neat story, is it not? I only hope that the situation created by the election of "Roosevelt and McKinley" may suit the Scandinavians, who really have played a great part in that great event.

When attending the meeting of the Scandinavian Singing Society of New York last Monday night I was asked by some of the members to make, through the columns of the DAILY PEOPLE, an appeal to the party members to try a scheme to get their papers on more of the stands of the news-dealers than at present. Said comrades had made an arrangement with their dealers that if he kept a certain number of copies of the DAILY PEOPLE every day they would secure him from loss by paying at the end of the week for all the copies not sold. In that way it would not do for the dealer, as often is the case, to refuse on the ground that the papers not sold were not returnable. The comrades thought that some activity of this kind ought even to be made the business of all the party organizations.

VICTOR FUNKE.
New York, November 21.

Prosperity Strikes Pueblo.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—Just prior to the recent election the section men on the Santa Fe railroad were told that if Bryan was elected their pay would be reduced. Almost as soon as the bal-

lotting was over the wages of these men were reduced from \$1.40 per day to \$1.20. They got what they voted for and would have received the promised cut if the Weary Willie of two salt voyages had been elected.

The Colorado Fuel and Iron Company has declared five dividends in the last months, four of them at eight per cent each and one of twelve per cent, being forty-four per cent in ten months. About half of the Slavs who produce these dividends get the munificent sum of \$1.55 or less per day with good prospects for a cut to the producers and a corresponding increase to their masters.

It is exhilarating to think of the chief executive elected by the slaves he skins and his lieutenant, the president of the labor organizations of the State, as running mate on the same capitalist ticket. The former has skinned more men than any individual employer Colorado ever contained and the latter has made more loud professions of being a friend to the working class and as "good as a Socialist as you," than any fraud of the inter-mountain country.

The ignorant ass as chief executive and the blatant fakir as president of the Senate of the Centennial State.

The various combinations of capitalist tickets with their stool pigeon Debserie, "Labor," and other false tickets took all the wind and water out of the Socialist Labor Party in the late election and left nothing but solid meat and fighting muscle.

A great many are already sorry they voted against the only party that maintains the fight for labor, and sorrier they will be as time grows apace and the buzz-saw rips.

NIXON ELLIOTT.
Pueblo, Col., November 18.

On the Platform.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—In a recent issue of our noble paper a correspondent advocates the tacking on again to our platform of a number of clauses which shall state the Socialist's position with regard to propositions for the betterment of the condition of the working class.

For my part I was glad to see those resolutions expunged, which, up to the time of our last National Convention, formed part of our platform. They had accomplished their work: they had educated the people as to what might be expected when Socialists should get political power sufficiently into their own hands. But now their presence was harmful, as they had given rise to organizations and parties, based on those resolutions; and those organizations and parties were not only outside the Socialist Labor Party, but invariably displayed towards it hostility of the bitterest kind.

The Socialist Labor Party is not going to compete with the capitalist or semi-capitalist parties in the number of its promises or in the grandeur of them. A truly class-conscious wage-slave needs no printed platform. He knows his daily grind year in and year out, and his platform is to stop it. He knows he is a slave doomed most likely to be used up in a few years and kicked into a pauper's grave, so he is for abolition—abolition of wage-slavery—the most merciless and cold-blooded slavery ever known.

The more planks in a platform the more discussion, confusion and division. One simple truth, tersely stated, but comprehensive, will do more than many plans and issues.

The now powerful and imperialistic Republican party rose to power with a platform of one word—ABOLITION—what more do we want?

JOHN ROBERTSON.
San Francisco, Cal., Nov. 21.

The Motion Seconded.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—The suggestion of L. F. D. of Duluth, Minn., in to-day's PEOPLE that all comrades give a Christmas gift to the DAILY PEOPLE is O. K. Yes, comrades and friends, curtail your expenses and drop a dollar in the DAILY PEOPLE Christmas box. Section Hartford started to-day.

G. K. HARRISON, Organizer.
Hartford, Nov. 26.

Social Democracy, Prof. Heron?—No, Thanks.

("Advance," San Francisco, please copy.)

PRELUDE.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—The work-people must have their own political party. What party? The Socialist Labor Party. Why? Because it is the thoroughly trained army. FIRST IN THE FIELD, led by their own competent commanders. These commanders can be made or unmade at any time by the rank and file. Not so in the Social Democracy. Proof? Write to the much abused De Leon and the "martyr" Debs for the respective party constitutions. Compare them. There is a proof.

That sentence in my late letter of resignation which says that having received Populism, "I shall henceforth devote my energies to Socialism," having been changed by certain papers to "Social Democracy," I am receiving letters from Social Democrats greeting me as THEIR "Comrade." Deliver me from all bitterness toward these deluded "reformers" of labor unions, brilliant lecturers at so much a night, newspaper grafters and tax-dodgers. When I left the Peoples Party, I left for the revolutionary methods of the classical Marxist Socialist Party, not to further continue Populist tactics, under "Social Democracy," "Social Republicanism," or Pettigrew's proposed "Social Labor Party." Don't hold up your hands. Mr. Social Democrat in horror, for I can furnish more proofs than you will resist. It will be a sad fact that the next four years will add to the stretch; for what else can you expect, where any dissatisfied agitator can at any moment start a new Socialist party?

Because I am a class-conscious Socialist is why I chose the Socialist Labor Party. You, Mr. Kangaroo, have proved yourself a traitor to the cause of Socialism, because with your lips you profess belief in co-operation, yet in act, you set up would-be cut-throat competitive Socialist parties. Shame on you, when there was and is already a growing party in the field, which, for more than ten years of its struggling infancy, under the banner of the Socialist Labor

Party, proved its loyalty to Socialism! What is left for capitalism to do, when everyone is crying Socialism, but to encourage you to form new Socialist parties? Every member added to your factions sets a precedent for forcible rebellion to Socialism and dictates unfitness for the Socialist State. On the other hand, each member added to the Socialist Labor Party is a protest against allowing ambitious leaders, out of useful work, to ride rough shod over party rules and the fundamental principles of Socialism. The factions among you rebels appearing already, will slowly, yet surely be overcome by the united Socialist Labor Party. Your own loose methods will expose your capitalist leanings. Instead of grasping the whole truth of Socialism, biding time until the working class may be able to grasp the full wealth of noble life, properly theirs, these reactionary Social Democrats MUST HUNT EXCUSES for their political existence outside of the regularly long recognized and necessary Socialist Labor Party. All roads do NOT lead to Rome. Soon as those rival leaders turned their backs on the beaten track, their ambitions lead them to manufacture increasing differences to differentiate themselves from the original class-conscious movement, else workmen, depending on the Socialist Labor Party will say, "Why did they desert us?"

"Why do they now oppose us?" First they abused De Leon, then fall down in hero worship of Debs. Next they leave true proletarian tactics still further behind by joining in the adoption of the infamous Kautsky resolution, thus endorsing Millerand, and leaving themselves everywhere free to accept administrative positions by the grace of capitalism. Certain Kangaroos are bad enough now, but their degeneration has only begun. They are sliding backwards towards State Socialism, which is the most popularly expected. We are proud to have Professor Heron call us "tory Socialists," because the meaning of "tory" in this connection must be utmost fidelity to the Socialist State, without any capitalist leanings. The Social Democracy is not even democratic, because its constitution proves that, in reality, it is autocratically ruled by less than six men in Chicago, while the Kangaroo faction is controlled by other leaders in Springfield, Mass. Some of these factional "anarchists," as deserved punishment for their base act of forcible treachery on July 10, 1899, have no hear at all.

Whop it up, Mr. Social Democrat, for votes and endorsements from other political parties, turn vermins and labor unions, as you did in the last campaign, and William Liebenicht will rise from his grave and repeat his memorable words, "The value of a representative is small. But the value of the integrity of our party is immeasurable. IN IT RESTS OUR STRENGTH."

Finally, after the Socialist Labor Party has for years in vain tried "from the inside" to "reform pure and simple unions," we can afford to smile at the puerile pretension of Kangaroos and Debsites to do it. Preposterous! Those labor organizations are older and more conservative than even political parties. The Socialist Labor Party abandoned such useless attempts in 1890, when it began to expose the labor fakirs of the unions. The position of the Socialist Labor Party is correct that labor organizations are right and necessary, but THEY MUST REST ON A PROPER FOUNDATION. The non-political labor organization is founded on a false basis. By excluding the proper discussion of politics, such unions render themselves useless to their members, if not actually used by the capitalist class to keep the members in subjection. The non-political trade union not only does that, but breeds fakirs. For where the union is professedly non-partisan, it gives the opportunity for the leaders to make out of them political merchandise WHICH THEY DO. Consequently, the Socialist Labor Party and the Socialist Labor Party alone, rightly insists that trade unions be founded on the class-struggle as a political party.

The Social Democratic Party may grow in this western country and die like a mushroom. It will disappear as Populism did. Meanwhile many half-baked "reformers" favor it. They must learn their mistake by their own bitter experiences, lost energies, and coming disappointments, forced by capitalism, the egg, which hatches such chickens.

But the Socialist Labor Party is just peculiar enough to make no compromise whatever with capitalism. Our loud, my dear editor, is heavy, the road apparently long and arduous. But the workers need us, if only we are always true to them. "HAMMER" away. Success! Only has the race always thrown off its existing shell of gravity, the material human world has changed its location, and ceased to meet the needs and aspirations of the LIVE portion of the human race—in this case the workers themselves. Private capitalism now can only postpone possibly its day of judgment, through the loss of time and temporary confusion caused in CARELESS minds by the loose joints of Social Democracy allied with rebellious Kangaroos.

Your comrade,
HENRY R. FAY, of Section Minneapolis, Socialist Labor Party.
Minneapolis, Minn., November 23.

"The Men Without a Home."

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—In Sunday's "Letter Box" in answer to H. B. F. Minneapolis, Minn., allow me to say that "A Man Without a Country" is a book filled with the most nonsensical patriotic sentiment imaginable, and is not worth the necessary time to read it.

A. S. BROWN.
New York, November 26.

The Dr. Ross Case.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—Of course the forced resignation of Dr. Ross from Stanford University was a "slap in the face" of the "pure and simple" after just having voted for an "amendment" in favor of Stanford University, (and they are welcome to that "slap" inasmuch as they voted for a capitalist institution. It was no slap in my face however, as I voted the Socialist Labor Party ticket and against every "amendment" on the ballot.) It seems to me that Dr. Ross was forced to resign not because he at-

tacked the capitalist class as such, but because he attacked the interests of his individual employer, Mrs. Stanford, who is also an employer of Mongolians; and probably he also hurt the feelings of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, which is also an employer of Mongolians. But, from a Socialist's standpoint, I do not bewail his fate, but think that he is also welcome to his "slap in the face," as he is teaching false political economics, and is no real friend of labor.

A WAGE SLAVE.
San Francisco, Cal., Nov. 22.

Arousing Race Feeling.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—I noticed in to-day's DAILY PEOPLE Victor Funke's "hurrah for the Scandinavians." In connection therewith Comrade P. ought to have told "how Teddy flattered the ignorant Scandinavians in Jamestown, N. Y." when he spoke there.

It was in a Swedish church. The minister introduced Teddy something like this: "I need not say that this great assembly most cordially welcomes the highest official of the Empire State, Governor Roosevelt, you are in the hands of friends, to-night. I dare say no nationality will support you and the principles you represent so loyally on election day as will the Swedes all over the United States."

"Let the church echo with patriotism and enthusiasm to-night. I want to hear applause for our State's fearless and popular governor. (Great applause.) To that applause for our next vice-president I insist that there be added a tender of applause for Theodore Roosevelt and 1904." And again the church trembled with applause when Teddy came forward to speak.

Among other nonsense he said: "In one of the companies under my command at San Juan Hill was a Swede who made himself eminent for his heroism. In New York a Dane, J. Reis, gave valuable assistance in the police matter. Senator Knut Nelson of Minnesota, a Norwegian and Lutheran, is one of my best friends. One day when I was walking through a prominent street in New York I saw a stately blond policeman stop a pair of runaway horses. I inquired and learned that the strong brave man was one of your own countrymen. . . . Whenever I speak to Scandinavians I need not appeal to their feelings as foreigners. I can always speak to them as fellow-citizens. Do you know that a number of those who fought at Manila and Santiago were first Americans and then Scandinavians."

They all respect the star-spangled banner, and would not see it hauled down? I thank you for your kind attention."

ALVIN YOUNGQUIST.
New York, Nov. 21.

He Seizeds the Motion in a Practical Manner.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—In the DAILY PEOPLE of Sunday, November 25, there appeared a suggestion from L. D. Duluth, to the effect that each comrade should try and scrape up \$1 which should be donated to the DAILY PEOPLE as a Christmas gift. As I consider this a most excellent suggestion I will therefore start the ball a-rolling. Not alone can \$5,000 be raised as L. D. estimates, but even more if every comrade will do his duty; tackle his friends and urge upon them to do likewise. With a good sum raised in this manner we will be able to put the DAILY PEOPLE on a good footing, for we must have it, and we will have it permanently, as it is the gun with which the Twentieth Century Revolutionists (the fighting S. L. P.) will lay this capitalist system in ruins. Send in your money now, it will be just as good as if you wait till Christmas day as it will be used for the same purpose.

M. ROSENBERG.
1500—24 ave.
New York, November 28.

Impressions of the Debate.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—I was one of a number of comrades from three states—Connecticut, Rhode Island and New York—who in the terrible weather of last Sunday left their homes, paid their hard earned dollars to the railroad companies, and made their way to New Haven to hear the debate between De Leon and Harriman at the Grand Opera House. We expected to listen to a debate, where arguments would be brought forward not by De Leon only, but also by Mr. Job Harriman; where we would have a chance if not to become converted, then at least to hear a fair presentation of the side of our opponents.

In all of this we were greatly disappointed. All through the debate De Leon had to pitch his earnest and manly talk, his fiery eloquence, and his plain logic against the sleight-of-hand tricks of a crook and the performances of a clown. The centers of motion, not the centers of thought, seemed to have controlled Mr. Harriman. He worked over with the other members of his body than he seemed to do with his brain. His contortions and his twittings were side-splitting; but the occasion was too grave and too solemn for us to laugh. The little talking that he did besides the performing lacked a few little things: namely, logic, honesty and earnestness, and even grammar. Yes, even grammar. Our German friends in the Kangaroo camp of New Haven may not have noticed it and may not be willing to believe it; but it is so.

If Mr. Harriman is the Sun, the Jupiter, the Debs, so to say, of the Kangaroos, then one may imagine what the Stars, the lesser Gods of that political Olympus must be like and the mere thought of the intellectual darkness and the moral degeneracy in which the world of gods is shrouded, should be enough to send a shiver down the backs of common mortals.

Those among our ex-comrades in the Kangaroo camp who speak about union and who honestly hope that a reconciliation is still possible and will yet take place, those among the Kangaroos I honestly advise not to have Mr. Job Harriman as the star orator at meetings where intelligent Socialist Labor Party members are expected to be present, if they do not wish to add a feeling of contempt and disgust to the feeling of bitterness we already have for leaders like Mr. Job Harriman and for those that follow them.

Before closing I wish to call attention to a couple of incidents of the debate, which are very characteristic of the respective make-ups of the two hostile camps, the S. L. P. and the Kangaroos, and which are very striking in view of the accusation of our opponents that we have our little gods, whom we practically worship and blindly follow, and that we never want to listen to arguments from people who do not quite agree with us. As proof, the incidents I wish to refer to are priceless: They took place under conditions in every particular the same for the two camps besides were made up of actions which in their very nature are spontaneous, instinctive, dictated by the impulse of the moment and, therefore, the result of the respective habits of thought and feeling of the members of the camps in question.

Incident No. 1: When at a quarter to eight De Leon entered the Opera House and quietly made his way to the front, a close observer could have noticed that the S. L. P. members and sympathizers said to each other in a low whisper: "There comes De Leon," some adding, with a quiver of emotion in their voice, that the brunt of the great battle he is engaged in if fast turning his hair snow white. While remarks of this nature were made in a whisper by our men, De Leon quietly and unostentatiously passed the whole length of the House into the back of the stage. A few moments later Mr. Job Harriman entered the House, and the wild, savage yell—mind you, not applause, not greeting, but literally savage yell—of the Kangaroos in the hall reminded me at once of a Democratic caucus and the yells of the ward-healers giving tape to it. The same savage yelling was repeated time and again during the debate. So much for worshipping little gods by the S. L. P., and for the manliness of the Kangaroos.

Incident No. 2: All through the debate Harriman received from our men no less a respectful hearing than did De Leon. We did not whistle, we did not hiss; we thought the occasion too grave and too solemn for that, and the act of stealing a debater's time, a great crime for decent people to commit. If Harriman was twice interrupted for the twinkling of an eye it was when Mr. Job Harriman twice tried to deceive the audience by sleight-of-hand tricks, and a comrade near the stage, seeing it, exposed him and compelled him to desist by merely interposing no more than two or three words. Did the Kangaroos act in the same manner? Not on your life. With an effrontery and impudence seldom equalled they kept on whistling and hissing all through the TEN MINUTES which De Leon had to close after Harriman's HALF-HOUR of calumny, personal insults and deliberate lying. Thus De Leon was practically robbed of part of his closing ten minutes.

So much for the unwillingness of the S. L. P. to listen to arguments and the more than willingness of the Kangaroos to do it.

M. GOLDSMITH.
New Britain, Conn., Nov. 27.

An Added Insult.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—"An idle brain is the devil's workshop." Could this be thought of the capitalist Indies of the various capitalist churches of West Britain when they conceived another means of showing their uselessness to society? It was a splendid opportunity to insult the working class when they opened their rummage sale. This was how the affair was carried out, and it explains how several more members of the working class received a lesson in class consciousness, more to be valued than eloquent-speakers and realms of literature. First, they hired an empty store; from house to house, from cellar to attic, they gathered grandfathers' hats, aunts' old corsets, shirtwaists of the vintage of the eighties, old pants, shoes, straw hats (this in November), frayed collars, worn-out fancy fans, children's cast-off and broken toys, pieces of rusty stovepipe, in fact, any and every thing possible to mention.

The only qualification seeming to be that anything which was to be displayed for sale must be absolutely worn out, the older the better. How tiresome these labor must have been. What screams of delight must have been emitted from their dainty throats when Cholly donates his old dancing slippers or Chauncey contributes a broken golf stick. At last all is ready. One daily paper, seemingly deeply interested, stated "the ladies worked like common day laborers" in arranging the goods for sale. Many people attended the week's sale, and but few bought. Socialists found the place very attractive; contrasts were decisive; the lessons gained were many.

The door opens, and an Italian laborer comes in. At once the ladies go forth to meet him. Well, some of the DAILY PEOPLE readers have been in Baxter street. A superintendent of one of our largest factories acted as cashier, thanking each laborer as he hands in his two or three cents, as the case may be. Behind this counter stood a prominent capitalist, who has never been seen on the streets or in his office wearing a silk hat, but here he is, silk hat, linen duster, and the air of a boy at play.

See that prominent real estate man slap the back of a laborer and artistically rather up the wrinkles in the coat he is trying on.

See that lady with fingers encased in three-dollar gloves explain the merits of a dusty stove to a woman who buys her coal by the hod. Senators' wives, bankers' wives, merchants' wives and "somebody's" wives, they are all out on a lark. Busy, scheming, business men losing valuable (to them) time, for what?—to exhibit the growing insanity of the capitalist class. I believe it has no parallel in history. Their motto is: "On," and with the speed apply the lash to the back of the wage slave! Insult him, by all means try to make him more bestial! Let him move your glided chariot at a faster pace. Your noise, your laughter, does not drown the roar of the coming of the social revolution.

SPECTATOR.
New Britain, November 28.

The Vote in Rhode Island.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—The "Advance" from San Francisco, formerly the "Class Struggle," in its last issue gives 1,195 votes to Malloney and Remmel in Rhode Island. It then brusquely compares that poll with the vote of 1898, and states the S. L. P. has lost its of-

ficial standing here. Of course it is useless to give any heed to the "Advance" of itself, but its bald assertions are often put forth without being credited to their rightful source, and with the "Advance" left out, its statements are shorn of their unreliable character. The figures used by the "Advance" were the first returns and it was evidently not unwilling to accept them as final and official. The actual count gives Malloney 1,423, while as far as our official standing is concerned, we would have retained it even if we had not polled a single vote. The official status of parties in this State is determined by the vote cast in the State election. As it is, however, Malloney obtained two and one half per cent of the total vote, and two per cent is all we would have needed in any event.

We received 2,600 votes last April and consequently have been afflicted with a bad slump. Comrades generally were expecting great returns. The experiences of 1896 should have made them more wary in their hopes. Then Matchett polled 558 votes as against 1,272 the preceding spring, the loss being more than fifty per cent. The loss this month as compared with that of 1896 leaves a balance of about ten per cent in our favor.

The splendid vote polled here previously has not been lost, though there is little comfort in a vote that shifts from us in a presidential campaign. In Providence the municipal ticket in some instances went ahead of former years, while the legislative candidate there beat all records, his poll running above 1,500—nearly eight per cent of the total city vote, the heaviest yet cast in Providence.

We would be infinitely more satisfied if those voters who cannot mark a straight Socialist ballot would leave us alone, but that is a matter over which we have no control. It is apparent from the variations in the figures that many voters inclined to Socialist principles have yet to learn that there should be a sharp and complete cleavage between them and the capitalist parties in national as well as in State elections.

THOMAS CURRAN.
Providence, R. I., Nov. 28, 1900.

As to the Platform.

To the DAILY PEOPLE.—In regard to the matter of the platform of the S. L. P., I believe comrade Robertson from San Francisco is entirely correct. If we take a historic view of previous revolutions, we find that when such movements were ripe they crystallized down into a single sentence or watch-word. The starting point of the American capitalist revolution against English feudalism was the murdering of Jakob Leister. When the movement was ripe, the battle cry came: "No taxation without representation." The precipitation of the French revolution followed closely upon Jean Jacques Rousseau's "Freedom, equality, fraternity." The chattel slavery question was with the founders of the republic. When the movement of the revolution in the North was ripe, the watch-word was "Abolition."

The wage slavery question has been as old as the chattel slavery question. It has reached the historic point where the watch-word must come, where the platform of our party must be crystallized into one solid sentence:

ABOLITION OF WAGE-SLAVERY!

The rest will follow by necessity.

C. C. CROLEY.
Pleasantville, N. J., Nov. 27.

Divine Harmony and Harmony of Divines.

The sun, as some great man long ago discovered, was slowly setting in the west. Nothing hinges on this statement, so we refer all readers to the Old Farmer's Almanach. At that moment the tall form of a solitary candidate could be seen winding slowly through a political campaign. Then it rapidly unwound again. This phenomenon was so obvious, and the action was repeated so frequently that there could no longer be any doubt but that the solitary form was Eugene V. Debs. He was evidently coming together again. In the distance was the great Social Democratic party, or what was left of it, and the members, also, were coming together again for the forty-fourth time. Debs saw that and his great heart yearned for unity, and he at once decided on a lecture tour—cash payments in advance.

It was a proud moment when he saw the Rev. George Herron, the Rev. Frederick Strickland, the Rev. Charles Casson, the Rev. F. O. C. Macarthy, the Rev. Father Grady, the Rev. Job Harriman, the Rev. Thos. Jones, and the other pulpits teaching the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and "Now I Lay Me Down to Sleep" to those "Volkszeitung" Germans who had become Socialists because they thought it was the shortest road to Atheism. Already it was evident that the Singing, Death, Cremation, and Turn societies were destined to be the nucleus of innumerable Sunday schools, and instead of passing the Sabbath tilting the foaming reins, and gazing into vacancy as they looked into each other's eyes, their hallooings would rise in a swelling chorus, and the hearers would echo and re-echo while they roared "Number 20 of the Revue Hymnal."

They caught sight of the great leader—and he was a sight—so they shrieked with one accord, "Speech! Speech!" He did so.

"My friends, we all know the beautiful story of the prodigal son, and how he wasted his substance. He went into a far country, New York. I think it was, and there were hundreds of thousands of trade unionists, and they endorsed him. And he said, 'Verily, this is a clench.' And his head arose in rebellion against his hat, and crowded it off the face of his brow. From that endorsement he expected many things, but when the result was counted, then he had nought wherewith to cover his boast, and he shivered with

the chill that came from his enemies' laugh. Then he returned to his own home, and they killed the fatted calf. I am the man, and I want that calf. I need it in my business. The story is beautiful, and my friends, we should live up to its divine teachings. In no other way will the working class, rising superior to its weakness, and bound in the inextricable union that knows no breaking, march with unfettered tread to the goal of its emancipation."

The applause was deafening, but when it had subsided one man, grizzled with many midnight encounters with the last keg, arose and remarked:

"It is all very fine, vi are ve to be always the fatted calf alreety? There is no fun in it. I won't pe it yet again."

He was told to sit down, and "illustrate the point in a practical way, and to give an object lesson in the art, he was at once, completely crushed, for, from under the group which was sitting could be heard a faint voice, but sarcastic without saying: "This is vot you call solidarity! I don't thought!"

"What is the trouble there?" said a stern voice—in the rear, as might be expected. It was the voice of the Rev. Job Harriman, and he was with it. He stood there an inspiring spectacle, and the only living illustration of a human "air-shaft." He rubbed his hands with joy as he saw them all united on one man, some standing, some sitting, but all animated with the desire to walk to the co-operative commonwealth via the neck of the gentleman who had, much against his will it is true, provided it for this occasion only. There was nothing left for him to do but to complete the union, so he also jumped on. When they stepped off, the man was lifeless, and all present saw immediately that he was in a fit condition to become a loyal member of their party.

The Rev. Herron took a half hitch in his reputation, and the semi-Rev. A. M. Simmons, ex-editor, presented a plan that could not fail: "It will be observed that there are numerous Democrats, Populists, Social Democrats, and other men who have not a party, therefore they are all on the road to Socialism. What was wanted to hold them all was a platform which contained the least possible amount of Socialism, and the greatest possible amount of everything else. Each man should be allowed to incorporate his own plank, and thus all would be satisfied. Working for different objects, on a platform that meant different things, pulling in opposite directions, a platform that you did not believe in, must ultimately lead along the right road. There could be no quarrel over what your fellow men believed or did so long as there was incorporated in the platform a plank that would cover anything." It was a great idea, and the gathering adopted as its motto "Each for all, and a plank for each."

There was only one discordant note, only one element that caused uneasiness, and that was the more they united the farther they seemed to be apart. But, then, that only served to prove that men could work in harmony provided they remained at a distance, both in person and intention. That was all that was needed. It could be distinctly seen that a party which repudiated fusion could honorably enter into alliance with another party of antagonistic views, because a man is known by the company he keeps, and if those other persons are in the company of Socialists they will be looked upon as Socialists and the work will be accomplished. There are evidently more ways of bringing about the co-operative commonwealth than of killing a cat.

While this was being unanimously adopted, there was a hungry crowd of gentlemen standing around. All brought with them numerous "best years of their lives" which they were willing to sacrifice for the noble work. The only thing that they required was that they receive so much per year, for those best years, and so much per life for those lives. With true clerical instinct they had learned to follow, wherever it paid.

Then up rose the philosopher of the occasion. His tall commanding form was nearly five feet two in his stocking feet, only he did not wear stockings. He wished that incorporated in the platform, and desired that it be made the one test for membership. He was an English Socialist of long standing for his height, and had written several books on the subject. As he had published the fact that he did not know what he was talking about gave special weight to what he said. After three days discussion his plan was submitted to the branches for a vote.

But slack and alas! Who had the branches? The committee in Chicago claimed some, and the branches denied it. The branches claimed by Springfield also repudiated the allegation. Then those which denied membership were allotted to those with whom they disclaimed affiliation. A comparison was made and those affiliated with both were stricken off the books. Those left amounted to just one branch, and it was independent. Unity had been accomplished!

Again the same sun was sinking in the same West, and with it was also sinking a most peculiar and diabolical looking instrument. Some said it was a ladder brush; others claimed that it was a fractured half-schoppen. It was neither; it was the immortal "hand with a radish," and it went down to rise no more.

The "Socialist" of Seattle, Wash., tearfully says that there were many, many votes cast for the Socialist Labor Party which were intended for the Social Democratic party. "Already three persons have written" to that office saying so. There is no use trying to claim the Socialist Labor Party vote. Why not take a shy at the Republican and Democratic vote and claim that it was cast under the misapprehension that it was being cast for the Social Democratic party? Why not, on that basis, also, claim that Debs was elected and sit in the president's chair—in spirit? There is no necessity in being half-hearted about claims, especially as all former ones did not work right, and the same ones must be made to explain the reasons.

OFFICIAL NOTICES.

National Executive Committee.

The regular meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party was held at the Daily People Building, Monday evening, December 3.

Forbes in the chair.

Receipts for the week, \$39.58; expenditures \$39.08.

Organizer Abelson of Section New York reported the following vote for nominations for the National Executive Committee:

Peter Fielden	329
Julius Hammer	342
Elihu Felt	332
August Gillman	330
John T. Kennedy	315
Rudolph Katz	306
Adolph Klein	296
Bernard O'Toole	290
Charles G. Teicher	280
Timothy Walsh	277
Herman Weinstein	273
Adam Moran	267
William Kelly	211
Joseph Shurey	209
Dow Hoffman	195
Stephen Mumery	181
William F. H. B.	178

The National Secretary was instructed to have ballots printed to be sent to the Sections of the Party in accordance with Article V, Section 1, of the Constitution. Section Chairman reports the expulsion of William Mark for voting the Republican ticket.

National Organizer Peppin reported on his work in Illinois.

National Organizer Dalton reported on his work in the State of New York.

Interesting reports continue to reach headquarters relative to the way the pure and simple kept their agreement to vote for Debs. Last week it was \$1. Louis that gave an interesting report; this week it is Texas, as the following extract from a San Antonio letter will indicate:

"In Texas, as everywhere else, the Debsites got badly left. Here they had a paper of their own—the Farmer's Review, they took into the fold every crook that professed to be radically inclined; they framed on the pure and simple, and coaxed the erstwhile Populists or radical Democrats; and their claims before election—forty thousand at least, and a hundred thousand would not have surprised them. In San Antonio, where these low-down workers had all pledged themselves to vote for Debs, and there are 200 of them, as well as many more pure and simple, Debs got 147 votes.

As to the rigid, strict, uncompromising, persevering spirit of the S. L. P., the following brief letter from the Secretary of the Washington State Committee is self-explanatory. It is but one of hundreds that reach the National Executive Committee:

"We have at least made a slight increase in spite of the Debsian annex to capitalist parties, in spite of their treacherous attempt to divide the working class by a fake ticket. They brag: 'We have more votes than you.' Certainly they have. So have the other enemies of the wage workers, the Demo-Repulic parties with their Bryans and McKinleys. That is why we are. It is our work to overcome all fake parties and force the enemy, with their flunkies and lackies following, into one camp. But in spite of the fact that they have fought us hard, they have not realized their boast that they would kill the S. L. P. In spite of the fact that they shook the earth with the blatant yaps of Bill the Noisy from Windy Nebraska and baited their line with the Debsomania from Indiana, they have no more than kept us from getting what was NOT ours. We have the Socialist vote; they caught the freaks. We know now what we have to fight. Watch our banner from this time on. Live the Revolution!"

Sections are again urged to return campaign subscription lists. Send the list to the State Committee. Sections in States where there are no State Committees are to return the lists to the National Secretary.

JULIAN PIERCE, Recording Sec.

Massachusetts State Committee.

The members elected to the Socialist Labor Party State Committee of 1901 are hereby called to meet, for the purpose of legally organizing, on Saturday, January 5, 1901, at the headquarters of the Socialist Labor Party, 45 Elliot street, Boston at 7.45 p. m. The following districts have held Senatorial conventions and elected State committee-men: first and second Bristol, first Plymouth, first Suffolk, first, second, fourth and fifth Essex, third, fourth and fifth Middlesex, Middlesex and Essex, and second Hampden. Caucuses were held in the second Middlesex District, but the Secretary has received no notice of a Senatorial convention being held there. The Secretary will send credentials to the State committee-man for that district as soon as he gets the name and address. The State convention held September 4, 1900, elected ten members as members at large of the State committee of 1901. These are also notified to attend.

Sections and members at large in Senatorial districts where no caucuses were held are requested to send to the undersigned or to Alfred E. Jones, 200 Bradford street, Everett, the name of a loyal comrade in their district for State committee-man. The State Committee will, as soon as organized, appoint those comrades to fill the vacancies.

J. O'HEILLY, Secretary.

Massachusetts State Committee, Socialist Labor Party for 1901.

Socialist Ticket in Cambridge, Mass.

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., Dec. 3.—The Socialist Labor Party of this city, at a convention held on November 27, decided, for the second time in its history, to enter the municipal campaign. A complete city ticket was accordingly nominated, as follows:

For Mayor, J. W. Daehman.
For Aldermen, Ward Five, Ed. A. Chester, William E. Stacey.
For Alderman-at-large, Ward Five, Nils T. Fuglestad.

Ward Two, Christian Beck.
Ward Three, Gustave A. Bläschke.

COMMON COUNCIL.

Ward Two, Oscar A. Blanquist.
Ward Three, William J. Sullivan.
It is confidently believed that a large vote will be cast for this ticket. This belief is based on the vote of last year, when our candidate for alderman in one ward polled over 1,100 votes. Every indication favors an increase over this vote this year.

Woburn S. L. P. Nominations

WOBURN, Mass., Nov. 29.—The Socialist Labor Party of Woburn, at its Municipal convention, of which Peter Nelson was chairman and John Daley secretary, for Mayor, John P. Bradley; Board of Public Works, John W. Kegan; Aldermen-at-large, John O'Donnell, Cornelius J. O'Brien, John A. Johnson, James L. McDevitt, Joseph V. Schugel, and William H. O'Brien.

S. L. P. Nominations in Lynn.

LYNN, Mass., Nov. 29.—Lynn Section, S. L. P., has nominated the following ticket for the Municipal election: Mayor, Frank Kiefer; Assessor, John P. Coyle; School Committee, Herbert R. Manley, Daniel S. Law; Aldermen: Ward 3, George R. Pearce; Ward 4, John Bailey and Michael D. Fitzgerald; Ward 5, Michael Crotty and James Goodwin; Ward 6, Thomas Cashman and Charles N. Wentworth; Ward 7, Charles Sahn. Common Council: Ward 3, Oscar E. Morse; Ward 4, James J. Travers; John O'Donnell, John Hickey, Frank B. Jordan and John Henley; Ward 5, David W. Shaw; Ward 6, Walter Deans and Owen Hughes; Ward 7, Thomas M. Birtwell.

Section Lynn's Officers for Next Term.

LYNN, Mass., Dec. 3.—Section Lynn, S. L. P., at its regular meeting on the above date elected the following officers for the first six months of 1901:

Organizer, Francis Ambrose Walsh, 384 Boston street, Lynn, Mass.

Recording and corresponding secretary, John Ryan.

Financial secretary, Thomas Burtwell.

Treasurer, Gallagher.

Press committee, Hughes, Walsh and Burtwell.

Grievance committee, Hughes Coyle and Deans.

Official Notice.

CLEVELAND, O., Nov. 29.—Section Cleveland, of the Socialist Labor Party, will hold a convention on Sunday, Dec. 9th, 2.30 p. m., at Party Headquarters, 256 Ontario street, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the different offices to be filled at the Municipal election next April.

All Party members are hereby earnestly requested to be present.

The branches in the various districts are requested to make nominations for the City Council at their next regular meeting.

By order of the General Committee of Section Cleveland, S. L. P.,

FRANK ERBEN, Organizer.

108 Starkweather avenue.

Donations to the Daily People.

(Week ending Nov. 24.)

Previously acknowledged, \$2,533.85

Milwaukee, Wis., Huber 40c.

Schuster \$1, Kloth 40c, Vierthaler \$2, Fuhr 40c, Schmidt 40c, Rubinger 40c, Schmette 40c, Schnable 20c, Schienbein 40c, Wilke \$2.

8.00

Schenectady, N.Y., E. L. Lake \$1, E. F. L. Lake \$1, Weinberger \$1, Clubs 1 to 4 \$1 each, \$4.

7.00

Elizabeth, N. J., Hoffman 45c, McGarry 25c, May 50c, Kunkold 25c, Sauer 25c, Fruth 25c, Hansen 25c, Press 25c, Koerner 25c, Jentracke 15c, Wagner 25c, Hueh 25c, Peterson 25c, Seromovitch 25c.

3.85

Waterbury, Conn., J. Arela \$1.

1.00

Jacksonville, Ill., Renner 50c.

2.00

Morris 50c, Lacy 50c, Hoffman 50c.

2.00

San Antonio, Tex., Bowers 25c.

1.50

Federoff 25c, Pollard 50c, Lietner 50c.

2.00

Cleveland, Ohio, Alzuhn 25c.

2.00

Klien 25c, Zillmer 50c, Kubanek \$1.

10.00

St. Louis, Mo., Heitzig \$8; Wiperman \$8; Dankoler \$3.

3.25

New Haven, Conn., Sever 50c; Pfirman 50c; Sobey 50c; Marx 50c; Stedol 50c; Maher 50; Feldman 25c.

2.00

Plainfield, N. J., By Branch \$2.

4.25

Essex County, N. J., Owen \$2.50; Newey \$1; Waltz 25c; Vogel 25c; Duggan 25c.

.50

Hoboken, N. J., J. Sweeney 50c.

1.00

Jersey City, N. J., E. F. Wegener \$1.

2.00

Union Hill, N. J., Shepps 10c; Fricke 10c; Becker 10c; Thammel 10c; Betsch 10c; Dietrich 5c; Weibert 10c; G. E. 25 c.; C. L. 25c; Blome 25c; for subsequent week \$1.05.

2.50

Richmond County, N. Y., Sargder \$1; Clark 50c; Driscoll \$1.

1.00

New York—Excelsior Literary Society \$1.

2.50

6th and 10th A. D. Scherer \$1; Weisslowitch \$50; Hurwitz \$1.

2.50

13th A. D., Grünwald \$1; Haller \$1; Oest 50c.

2.50

15th and 17th A. D., O'Toole \$1; Cokerove \$1.

2.00

16th A. D., a friend, 25c; Weinberger 25c; Gocherer 25c; Gocheritz 25c; Moskowitz 25c; Gottlieb 25c; Lefkowitz 25c; Rosenfeld 25c; Bear 25c; Herskowitz \$1; Henchel 25c; Stark 25c; Fuerman \$1; Friedman 25c; Wolf 25c; Platzner 25c; Wohl 25c; Feldman 25c; Lederman 50c; Rotitz 50c.

7.00

18th A. D., per Owen Diamond 5.00

20th A. D., S. Wanner 5.00

19th and 21st A. D.'s, Mittelberg 50c; Mandl 40c; Ellberg 50c; Brandes 50c; Orloff 50c; Douai 50c; Rasmussen 50c; J. W. G. 50c; Franck 50c; Rosenkranz 50c; Wein-

man, 50c; Petersen, 50c; Leiminger, 50c.

23d A. D., Rubin \$1; Tzemakh \$1; Plamondon, 50c; Koffman 50c; Busson, 25c; Larsen, 50c; Westergaard, 50c; Pollock, 50c; Bana, 20c.

4.95

30th A. D., Gillhaus, 50c; Moren 50c; Samuels, \$1; Heyman, 50c; Klein, 50c; Barthel, 50c.

3.50

32nd and 33rd A. D., D. M. Swenson \$2; J. W. \$1.

3.00

34th and 35th A. D., Hermansen, 50c; Hodas 25c; Johansen 50; Gajewski 50c; Kinneally 50c; Crawford 50c.

2.75

Brooklyn, 7th A. D., W. H. Wherry \$1; B. Wherry \$5; Murphy \$1.50; Oehlcker \$1, bet won by Oehlcker \$1.

6.75

Brooklyn, 13 and 14 A. D., Christiansen 25c, Muntefering 25c, Kuck 25c, Fredericksen 25c, Lochr 20c, Belapolsky 15c.

1.35

Brooklyn, 20 A. D., Zoeller 25c, Mueller 50c, Cash 50c, Stegeman 50c, Forbes 50c, Malament 50c.

2.75

Total.....\$2,651.15

HENRY KUHN,

National Secretary.

Daily People General Fund.

Previously acknowledged, \$14,810.64

Received for Minor Fund from E. J. Morin, Duluth, Minn., 25c; collection at general meeting of Section New York, less rent of

hall, \$35.01; Geo. F. Spettel, St. Paul, Minn., \$3; Condersport, Pa., Caussain, \$1; Francois, \$1; Weibel, \$1; Daniel Law, Lynn, Mass., \$1; E. W. White, Polk, Pa., 25c; from dissolved Liedertafel, Buffalo, N. Y., \$5.

47.51

Total.....\$14,858.15

HENRY KUHN,

Financial Secretary-Treasurer, Daily People Committee.

General Agitation Fund.

Previously acknowledged, \$1,283.04

Minnesota State Committee, on list.....2.50

Section Clinton, Iowa, per J. R. Popin.....3.00

Theo. Zollner, Little Falls, Minn., per J. R. Popin.....1.00

Section Baltimore, Md., per C. H. Corrgan.....6.00

Virginia State Committee, per C. H. Corrgan.....23.00

Section Altoona, Pa., per C. H. Corrgan.....4.00

Section Patton, Pa., per C. H. Corrgan.....6.00

Section Houtzdale, Pa., per C. H. Corrgan.....10.00

Section DuBois, Pa., per C. H. Corrgan.....3.00

23d A. D., N. Y.: one-half on list 608.....6.00

Total.....\$1,347.54

NOTE.—Sections and State Committees are urged to return lists for this fund without delay; sections in organized States to make returns to their respective State Committees, isolated sections to report to the undersigned.

HENRY KUHN,

National Secretary, 2-6 New Reade street, N. Y.

Know What They Want.

Votes may come and votes may go but principles live on forever.

It is far better to have ten men who know what they want and how to get it than to have a hundred who do not know what they want, nor how to avoid getting what they do not want but yet vote for, viz., lenden bread bot and heavy when on strike.

When the campaign started the 1st, 3d and 6th Assembly Districts had only two active members, now we have eight, and expect to more than double that before next year's campaign is started. We have changed from 261 Hudson street to 407 Canal street, where we meet every Monday night in the large hall. All comrades and sympathizers living or knowing any one living in any of the three districts should send their names and addresses to the secretary, J. Cullen, 107 4th avenue, City. We expect before many months have passed to establish a club in one of the districts. Though our vote may fall our membership increases and that is the best sign of a healthy growth that we can wish for.

Fraternally yours

THE SECRETARY.

New York, December 3.

A Good Subject.

Section, Erie county, Pa., hereafter meets every Friday evening, 7.30 sharp, at Gudd's Hall, corner of Twentieth street and Peach street. All readers of the WEEKLY PEOPLE are requested to join the section and bring their friends. Next Friday night will be discussion meeting. Subject: Pure and Simple Unionism or Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance Unionism.

2.50

TROY, N. Y., Dec. 3.—W. S. Dalton lectured before Socialist Labor Party Section, Troy yesterday, on the subject of Socialist Labor Party Tactics.

The members were well pleased with the clear cut exposition of the speaker, who plainly showed that only by its uncompromising tactics can the Party expect to win the victory over capitalism and its allies of every kind.

2.50

The Loren Fund.

SOMERVILLE, Mass., Dec. 4.—Up to date the committee in charge of the Loren fund has received thirty-four dollars (\$34). Acknowledgments, in detail, will be sent to the DAILY PEOPLE the last of this week.

2.50

REPUBLICANS CARRY HAVERHILL.

As we go to press we receive the following telegram from Haverhill regarding the Municipal election held there Tuesday, December 4:

Haverhill, Mass., Dec. 4.

Republicans make clean sweep. Debits up the creek. M. T. BERRY.

Dalton to Speak in Boston.

W. S. Dalton, of Seattle, Wash., will lecture in Caledonia Hall, 45 Elliot street, Boston, Sunday, December 9th, 1900, at 3 p. m.

Subject: The Social Democratic Party. The Socialist Labor Party: Which party truly represents the interests of the Working Class? Tickets 10c.

Comrades of Boston and vicinity should attend this lecture and bring their friends.

1.35

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

There will be a meeting of Section Milwaukee, Saturday evening, December 8, at Kaiser's Hall, 300 Fourth street. Every comrade should be present as there are several committees that have reports and recommendations ready for this meeting.

FRANK L. WILKE, Org.

Chicago, Ill.

Section Chicago will hold a mass convention Friday, December 7, at 8 p. m., at 48 West Randolph street, for the purpose of nominating candidates for the different offices to be filled at the municipal election to be held next April. Every comrade is earnestly requested to be present.

THOMAS STEIGERWALD,

Organizer, 206 Illinois street.

Somerville S. L. P. Ticket.

SOMERVILLE, Mass., Dec. 4.—The candidates of the Socialist Labor Party at the city election to be held December 11 are: For Mayor, T. C. Brophy; Alderman-at-large, Augustus F. Pecheur, of Ward 2; Harold Hellberg of Ward 6; Ward Alderman, Ward 2, Charles A. Johnson; School Committee, Ward 2, Louis H. Pecheur.

The highest vote received by a candidate of the Socialist Labor Party at the State election was 950—for Charles A. Johnson, candidate for Register of Deeds. The Democrats did not nominate.

Notice to S. L. P. & S. T. & L. A. Secretaries.

Secretaries of S. L. P. sections and of local and district alliances connected with the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance, are requested to communicate matters of general and special industrial interest, such as reports of strikes, boycotts, lock-outs, etc., to the Editor Field of Labor, DAILY PEOPLE, 2-6 New Reade street, New York City.

LETTER BOX.

Off-Hand Answers to Correspondents.

[No questions will be considered that come in anonymous letters. All letters must carry a bona fide signature and address.]

R. P. NEWARK, N. J.—Let's first see if we can agree upon the facts. Here is one: In the 12th Worcester, Mass., Representative District, the Socialist Democracy won the election. The candidate was John C. Smith.

Here is another fact: The Socialist Democratic municipal platform in Lynn, Mass., has a plank which calls for "municipal day nurseries." Presumably you know what that means, and what it implies.

Do you deny these facts? If you don't, what becomes of your claim that we do the Socialist Democracy wrong in saying that its Socialist claims are in bad faith?

A. S. A. LINCOLN, NER.—It depends upon the extension of the restriction given to the word "external." The merchandise labor-power is so closely woven and interwoven in the very tissues of the workingman's life that to separate it is tantamount to a complete annihilation of the one. Hence the merchandise labor-power may be considered an external object.

P. F. COLUMBUS, O.—Can't make out your complaint. You send two pages. The first (presumably it is the first) is blank. The second contains only six lines giving no idea of what was meant to proceed.

E. D. E. HOROKEN, N. J.—If, so soon after having divided, you want to unite again, let the conclusion justified that you now want to unite only in order again to divide?

N. A. G. CLEVELAND, O.—Your argument, basing itself on the number of votes, leaves us unaffected. It only photographs people like the extensive drapery they have not physique enough to stand on their own merits. Just so with folks whose principles are spindly-legged and shallow-chested. They have not the strength to stand enough to respect themselves; they feel weak when they stand alone; they can't stand up to the right when put in a wrong does not become right when multiplied. Bryan and McKinley had infinitely more votes.